

sivajñāna māpādiyam

K.Vajravelu mudaliar



Publications Division
Madurai Kamaraj University

SIVAJÑĀNA MĀPĀDIYAM

K. VAJRAVELU MUDALIAR

PUBLICATIONS DIVISION



MADURAI KAMARAJ UNIVERSITY

© *Rights reserved :*

Publications Division

**Madurai Kamaraj University,
Madurai-625 021.**

Publication No. 82

Rs. 44-50

Bibliographical information :

- 1) Author : Thiru K. VAJRAVELU
MUDALIAR
- 2) Title : SIVAJÑANA MĀPĀDIUM
- 3) Imprint :
 - i) Place of Publication : Publications Division
Madurai Kamaraj University
MADURAI-625 021.
 - ii) Year of Publication : 1985
 - iii) Edition : First Edition
 - iv) Number of Copies : 1200
 - v) Size of the book : 1/8 Demi
- 4) Number of pages : 10 + 456
- 5) Subject : Philosophy
- 6) Printers : The Diocesan Press
MADRAS-7



மாதவச் சிவஞான முனிவர்

தோற்றம்

பதினெட்டாம் நூற்றாண்டின் பிற்பகுதியில் திருநெல்வேலி மாவட்டத்தில் பொதிய மலைச்சாரலில் அமைந்துள்ள விக்கிரம சிங்கபுரம் என்னும் ஊரில் மாதவச் சிவஞான முனிவர் அவதரித்தார். அகத்திய முனிவரின் அருளால் ஏழு தலைமுறைகளாகத் தமிழ்ப் புலமை வாய்க்கப் பெற்ற வேளாண் மரபில் வந்து உதித்தார் சிவஞான முனிவர்.

இளமையில் துறவு

முனிவரின் பிள்ளைத் திருநாமம் முக்களாலிங்கர் என்பது. இவர் மிக்க இளம் பருவத்திலேயே சிவபெருமானிடத்தில் பத்திமையும், சிவனடியார்களிடத்தில் பற்றும் மதிப்பும் கொண்டு விளங்கினார். இவரது மாணவப் பருவத்தில் திருவாவடுதுறையிலிருந்து, விக்கிரம சிங்கபுரத்திற்கு எழுந்தருளிய துறவியரைத் தம் இல்லத்

திற்கு அழைத்துச் சென்று விருந்து செய்வித்துப் பின்னர் அவர் களுடனேயே திருவாவடுதுறை ஆதினத்தைச் சென்றடைந்தார்.

அக்காலத்தில் திருவாவடுதுறை ஆதின இளவரசு சுவாமிகளாய் எழுந்தருளியிருந்த வேலப்ப தேசிகரால், முக்களாலிங்கருக்குச் சமய தீக்கை, விசேட தீக்கை முதலியன செய்விக்கப் பெற்று “சிவஞானம்” என்ற தீட்சா நாமமும் வழங்கப் பெற்றது.

தமிழ் இலக்கிய இலக்கண நூற்களையும், சைவ சித்தாந்த சாத்திர தோத்திர நூற்களையும் சிவஞான முனிவர் தக்க ஆசிரியர்களிடம் பயின்று மிகுந்த புலமை பெற்றார். திருவாவடுதுறை ஆதினத்தின் குலதெய்வம் என்று பின்வந்த சான்றோரால் பாராட்டப்படும் திறமையும் ஒழுக்கமும் படைத்திருந்தார் சிவஞான முனிவர்.

முனிவர் அருளிய தலையாய நூற்கள்

மாதவச் சிவஞான முனிவரின் பெரும் புகழுக்கு அடிப்படையாய் விளங்குவன, அவர் மெய்கண்ட தேவ நாயனாரின் “சிவஞான போதத்திற்கு” வகுத்துத் தந்த சிற்றுரை. பேருரை ஆகிய இரண்டுமேயென்னில் அது மிகையாகாது.

மாபாடிய கர்த்தர்

வடமொழியில் பிரமகுத்திரத்திற்குப் பல்வேறு பேருரைகள் உள்ளன. அவ்வுரைகள்போல ஆகம அடிப்படையில் சாத்திரக் கருத்துக்களை விளக்கும் பேருரை தமிழில் இல்லாதிருந்த பெருங்குறையைச் சிவஞான முனிவரின் சிவஞான பாடியம் நிறைவு செய்தது. எனவே முனிவர் “மாபாடிய கர்த்தர்” என்ற சிறப்புப் பெயராலேயே குறிப்பிடப்படுகிறார்.

மாபாடியத்தின் தனிச் சிறப்பு

நுட்பமான பெருளைக் குறித்தெழுந்த “சிவஞான போதம்” செறிந்த கருத்துக்களைத் தன்னகத்தே கொண்டு விளங்குவது. இதன் தெளிபொருளை முன்னொடுபின் முரண்படாதவாறும், மலைவு தோன்றாதபடியும், அதிகரணம், நூற்பா, இயல் இவற்றின் இயைபை விளக்கியும் இலக்கண இலக்கிய நுட்பங்களைச் சுட்டியும் சிவஞான முனிவர் தமது பேருரையை வகுத்து அருளியுள்ளார். வேதம், சிவ ஆகமங்கள், சித்தாந்தப் பெருநூல்கள், திருமுறைகள் ஆகியவற்றிலிருந்து எண்ணற்ற மேற்கோள்கள் காட்டித் தன் பேருரையை வளப்படுத்தியுள்ளார் சிவஞான முனிவர். தருக்க நூல்முறை பிறழாமல் தடையெழுப்பி

விடை தந்து பிறர் கொள்கையை அறிவார்ந்த அடிப்படையில் மறுத்துச் சித்தாந்த சைவத்தை நிலை நாட்டுவதில் மாபாடியம் தன்னிகரற்ற உயர் நூலாக விளங்குகிறது.

முனிவர் வாழ்ந்த இடங்கள்

தூய துறவியாய், சைவத்தின் ஒளிவிளக்காய் வாழ்ந்த சிவஞான மாமுனிவர் காஞ்சிபுரத்திலும், செங்கற்பட்டு மாவட்டத்திலுள்ள குளத்தூர் என்ற சிற்றூரிலும், தொட்டிக்கலை என்ற ஊரிலும் சில ஆண்டுகள் வாழ்ந்து தமிழ்ப் பணியும், சைவத் தொண்டும் புரிந்து வந்தார். பல மாணவர்களுக்குக் கருவி நூல்களையும் சமய நூல்களையும் பயிற்றுவித்து வந்தார். அவர்தம் மாணவர்களும் சமய இலக்கிய உலகில் சிறப்பிடம் பெற்றவர்கள்.

கற்றோர்க்குத் தாம் வரம்பாகிய தலைமையர்

சிவஞான முனிவர் உரைநடையில் இளம்பூரணர், நச்சினார்க்கினியர், சேனாவரையர் போன்றோருடன் ஒப்பிடத்தக்க சிறப்பிடம் பெற்றவர். அதுபோலவே செய்யுள் திறத்தில் பண்டை நூல் இலக்கிய ஆசிரியர்களுடன் ஒருங்கு வைத்து எண்ணத் தகுந்தவர்.

இருமொழிப் புலமை

இவற்றோடு அமையாமல் வடமொழியில் மிகுந்த புலமை பெற்றிருந்த காரணத்தால் சிவஞான மாமுனிவர் பல வடமொழி நூல்களைத் தமிழில் மொழிபெயர்த்தருளியுள்ளார்.

முனிவர் அருளிய நூல்கள்—பல்துறை ஆற்றல்

அவரது நூற்களை வகைப்படுத்தினால் சிவஞான முனிவரது பல்துறை ஆற்றல் புலனாகும்.

இலக்கண நூல்கள்:

- (1) தொல்காப்பியச் சூத்திர விருத்தி
- (2) இலக்கண விளக்கச் சூறாவளி
- (3) நன்னூல் விருத்தியுரை (திருத்தம்)

இலக்கிய நூல்கள்:

- (4) காஞ்சிப் புராணம் (முதற் காண்டம்)
- (5) சோமேசர் முதுமொழி வெண்பா

- (6) குளத்தூர்ப் பதிற்றுப் பத்தந்தாதி
- (7) இளசைப் பதிற்றுப் பத்தந்தாதி
- (8) கலைசைப் பதிற்றுப் பத்தந்தாதி
- (9) கச்சி ஆனந்த ருத்திரேசர் பதிகம்
- (10) திருவேகம்பர் ஆனந்தக் களிப்பு
- (11) கலைசைச் செங்கழுநீர் விநாயகர் பிள்ளைத் தமிழ்
- (12) அமுதாம்பிகை பிள்ளைத் தமிழ்
- (13) அகிலாண்டேசுவரி பதிகம்
- (14) திருவேகம்பரந்தாதி
- (15) திருமுல்லைவாயிலந்தாதி
- (16) திருத்தொண்டர் திருநாமக்கோவை
- (17) பஞ்சாக்கர தேசிகர் மாலை
- (18) கம்பராமாயண முதற் செய்யுட் சங்கோத்தர விருத்தி
(உரை நடை)

தருக்க நூல்:

- (19) தருக்க சங்கிரகமும் அன்னம் பட்டியமும்
(மொழிபெயர்ப்பு)

சமய நூல்கள்:

- (20) சிவஞான மாபாடியம்
- (21) சிவஞான போதச் சிற்றுரை
- (22) சிவஞான சித்தியார் (பொழிப்புரை-கபக்கம்)
- (23) “என்னையிப் பவத்தில்” என்னும் செய்யுட் சிவ சம வாத
வுரை மறுப்பு
- (24) “எடுத்து” என்னும் சொல்லுக்கு இட்ட வைரக்குப்பாயம்
- (25) சித்தாந்த மரபு கண்டன கண்டனம்

மொழிபெயர்ப்பு நூல்கள்:

- (26) சித்தாந்தப் பிரகாசிகை
- (27) சுலோக பஞ்சகம்
- (28) சிவதத்துவ விவேகம்

முத்திப்பேறு

புலவர் போற்றும் பெரும் புலவராகவும் சைவ சித்தாந்தச் செந்நெறியின் ஒளிவிளக்காகவும் திகழ்ந்த மாதவச் சிவஞான முனிவர்திருவாவடுதுறையில் விசுவாவசு ஆண்டு சித்திரைத் திங்கள் ஆயிலிய நாளில் (1785ம் ஆண்டு ஏப்ரல் திங்கள்) நண்ணரிய சிவானந்த ஞான வடிவேயாகி அண்ணலார் சேவடி நீழலை எய்தினார்.

1. “சிவஞான முனிவரது தத்துவ ஆராய்ச்சி நுட்பத்தை நோக்கும்போது நீலகண்டரும், சங்கரரும், இராமாநுஜரும், மத்துவரும் ஓர் உருக்கொண்டு சிவஞான முனிவராய் வந்தனரோ என்றும், அவர்தம் தமிழ் நடையை நோக்கும்போது நக்கீரரும், இளம்பூரணரும், பரிமேலழகரும், நச்சினார்க்கினியரும் ஓர் உருக்கொண்டு அவராகப் போந்தனரோ என்றும் அறிஞர் கருதற்கு இடம் உண்டாகிறது.”

2. “கலைகள் எல்லாம் சிவஞான முனிவராகத் தோன்றின போலும். தருக்கமும், வியாகரணமும், இலக்கியமும், இலக்கணமும் தமிழ்ச் சிவஞான முனிவருக்குப் பணியாட்கள் ஆகித் துணைபுரியத் தவம் கிடந்தனவோ? என்னவோ? தெரியவில்லை.”

3. “சிவஞான முனிவர் கருத்துக்கள் பல தற்கால விஞ்ஞான கலைக்கு அரண் செய்வனவாய்த் திகழ்கின்றன”.

4. “சிவஞான பாடியத்தைப் பயில்வோர் வேத வேதாந்தம், ஆகமம், வேதாந்த சூத்திரம், சூத்திர பாடியங்கள் முதலியவற்றைப் பயிலாமலே, அவைகளைப் பயின்ற பயனைப் பெறுவர் என்பது திண்ணம்.”



திரு. க. வச்சிரவேல் முதலியார்

காஞ்சியில் 24-5-1906ல் பிறந்தார்.

காஞ்சிபுரம் பச்சையப்பன் உயர்நிலைப் பள்ளியில் கற்றுப்பின் சென்னை பச்சையப்பன் கல்லூரியில் 1929இல் பி. ஏ. பட்டம் பெற்றார். 1932இல் எல். டி., பட்டம் பெற்றார்.

1930விருந்து 1960 வரை காஞ்சி பச்சையப்பன் பள்ளியில் உதவி ஆசிரியராக இருந்து, பின் அதன் தலைமை ஆசிரியராக 6 ஆண்டுகள் பணிசெய்து, 1966இல் ஓய்வு பெற்றார். 1964இல் நல்லாசிரியர் என ஜனாதிபதி விருது பெற்றார்.

1923இல் முறையாகத் திருப்பாதிரிப்புலியூர் ஸ்ரீமத் நானியார் சுவாமிகளிடம் சிவஞானபோதச் சிற்றுரையைக் காஞ்சிபுரத்தில் கேட்கத் தொடங்கிச் சொந்த முயற்சியாலும் பெரியவர்கள் கூட்டுறவாலும் சைவசாத்திரங்களையும் இலக்கியங்களையும் பயின்று மேன்மை அடைந்தார்.

1944 நவம்பர் முதல் 1946 ஜூன் வரை மெய்கண்டார் கல்லூரி முதல்வர். 1975 செப்டம்பர் முதல் 1980 வரை மதுரை காமராசர் பல்கலைக் கழக சைவசித்தாந்தத் தத்துவத் துறையில் சிறப்பு அலுவலராகப் பணியாற்றினார்.

1951 நவம்பரில் திருப்பனந்தாள் காசிமடத்தினர் அண்ணாமலைப் பல்கலைக் கழகத்தில் நிறுவியுள்ள சித்தியார் சொற்பொழிவை, காசி, அலகாபாத் பல்கலைக் கழகங்களில் ஆற்றினார்.

நூல்கள்:

1. திருக்குறளின் உட்கிடை சைவசித்தாந்தமே.
2. திருக்குறள் துலக்கும் ஒழுக்க நெறி
3. சைவம்
4. திருக்குற்றாலத் தலபுராணப் பொழிப்புரை
5. சிவஞானபாடியத் திறவு.
6. திருவருட் பயன் உரை.
7. சைவ சித்தாந்தத் திறவு.

INTRODUCTION

ŚAIVA-SIDDHANTA

Definition :

Saiva-Śiddhanta is a way of life which believes in the existence of a Primal Being, preferably called by the traditional name Śiva. The term Śiva means the auspicious and connotes the Immutable consciousness-Bliss. In the religious philosophy of Śaiva-Siddhānta the Absolute of philosophy and the God of religion, whom we adore and worship, are one and the same.

Antiquity

It is useful to note that all religions begin with certain beliefs, forms of worship and prayers, develop into culture and finally takes the form of religious philosophy. The worship of Siva is one of the oldest practices of men and mostly widespread in India and elsewhere. Saint Mānikka vācakar, in Tiruvempāvai addresses Lord Śiva in the words, ‘ Ancient among the past existing are the ancient world, characterised by the newness of the newest simultaneously ’.¹ This shows that the religious philosophy symbolised by Śiva, is a perennial one and syncretic.

In regard to the antiquity of the religious thought two quotations may be given. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan in an essay *on religion* writes, ‘ Among the relics of Indus civilization are found figures

¹ Munnai-p- Pazham porutkum munnai-p-pazham porulē, pinnai-p-putumaik-kum pērttum apperriyanē—st. 9.

which are the proto-types of Śiva suggesting that he who explores his inward nature and integrates it is the ideal man'. He continues to say, 'This image has haunted the spiritual landscape of this country (India) from early times till today'. Dr. Mantriṇi Prasād of the Himāchal Pradēsh University, in a review of a book on 'Kashmir Śaivism' writes as follows: 'Indian philosophy reaches the summum bonum for mankind through yōga discipline, which has been patronised by the śaivite school of philosophy ever since the days of Indus valley civilization : Śaiva philosophy flourished in the south, the east and the north with equal zeal and vigour'. These observations point to the conclusion that Śaivism is the oldest extant religion and it has made significant contribution to the yōga culture.

3. *Historical background in the South*

Śaiva-Siddhanta which is mostly widespread in Tamil Nādu should be distinguished from the other phases of Śaivism such as Kashmir Śaivism and Vīra Śaivism which are monistic in conception. Śaiva-Siddhanta as developed and perfected in the South is theistic, realistic and pluralistic in character. While some thinkers base the unity of the universe by stressing on the identity of the various factors, the Śaiva-Siddhantins do the thing by organisation, resorting to the scientific attitude. Śaiva-Siddhanta is qualified by the expression, 'Suddādvaita'. It means that it interprets *advaita* as it is ; without any qualifying adjunct such as *kēvala* or *viśista* ; nor is it *bēdhavada*. Non-separableness is attributed to the primal Being which causes changes while yet remaining unchanging and unchangeable.

The term Śiva is conspicuous by its absence in the ancient Tamil literature. But still there is no doubt about the form or identity of the deity who had been held as the primal Being by the people of the Tamil land. In Tolkāppiyam the topic of Kādu vāzhttu refers to the invocation of Lord Śiva as the deity presiding over the cremation ground, which represents the primal Being who is the excess of the changing world. The first stanza in *Kali-t-tokai* that speaks of Lord Śiva as remaining alone with His spouse after involving all the worlds should be considered to illustrate the topic of *kādu vāzhttu* of Kāñchi-t-tiṇai of Tolkāppiyam. This is also evident from the references found in Sangam literature to the Lord of three eyes and his temple. There is also reference to Śiva in the twin epics that have followed the

Sangam literature. In Cilappadikāram, Iḷankō aḍikal refers to Śiva as *the Great one with form unborn* (pīravā yākkai-p-periyōn). This distinguishes Him from the individual selves which have organisms born as per their two deeds, merits and demerits. From the words of the Śaiva vādi of Maṇimēkalai in the town of Vañci we hear almost all the attributes of Śiva, which a modern Śaivite would like to ascribe to Him. But still it will be true to History to remember that the Śaivites of South India have followed the orthodox tradition while pursuing the theory and practice of their religion.

The ancient Hindus had collected their scriptural works and called the collection Vēdas. All those that held the vēdas authoritative were called orthodox or vaidiks, and those that did not accept them as the source of truth were called heterodox or avaidiks. The Śaiva-Siddhāntins claimed and had been accepted to be orthodox. Hence their responsibility was more than ordinary : they had to establish themselves as the true representatives of the vedik thoughts and at the same time they had to fulfil the requirements of the conditions for growth and progress and adhere to the scientific truths that are being revealed in course of time.

This modernism is fulfilled by them by giving suitable interpretations to the established scriptural dicta. This is done by this school of thought by establishing the postulate that the God-given scripture is of two kinds, general and special.

Saint Tirumūlar says, 'The Vēdas and Sivāgamās are the true scriptures divinely bestowed upon man ; and they are respectively general and special. Some may attribute difference between their conclusions ; but for the great they are identical.'²

This fundamental principle of unity between diverse scriptures has also been stressed by the religious teacher Sambandar of the 7th century, Sṛīkantha of the 11th century (or of earlier era) and Sēkkizhar of the twelfth century. The date of Tirumūlar may be taken to be not later than the 5th century. This has been followed by Meykandār, Arulnandi and others of this persuasion in later times.

This broad based nature of Śaiva Siddhānta is evident also in the fact that for it, not only the inherited authority of the inspired utter-

² Tirumantram, st. 2397.

ings, but also the intellectual authority of perception and inference is of equal value. Among the inherited authorities the school of thought does not see any difference between Samskrit and Tamil sources. Perhaps Tamil sources are more definite and clearer.

It is to be noted that the religious philosophy of Śaiva Siddhānta, though confined to India, has no single founder except the 'Divinity that shapes our ends.' It does not depend for its validity or distinct features on the religious or spiritual experience of any single individual. The system has grown from very early times and derives its authority from the intuitions and experiences of countless saints, sages and seers through out the ages. It got perfected, adjusting itself to the needs of the times and continues to be a living force. It influences and shapes the lives of men of its persuasion as culture and civilization advance. In fact, all systems of thought are in a way interpretations of the rich inherited traditional wisdom in accordance with the contemporary science.

It should be stressed that the Śaiva Siddhānta system has for its source material the classic works both in Sanskrit and Tamil. The Vēdas, the Upaniṣads and the Śivāgamas in Sanskrit, Sangam literature, Tirukkural and such other works in Tamil bear marks of its influence and contain most of its concepts. But the scope, depth and the essential and distinguishing features of the system are to be defined with reference to two sets of scriptural texts in Tamil. They are the twelve sacred books known as Tirumuraikal and the fourteen canonised philosophical treatises called the Śaiva Siddhānta Śāstras. For the Temple construction and its worship Śivāgamas are followed.

For a logical presentation of the system of Philosophy, one may refer to Siva Jñāna Bodham and its secondary Sivajñāna Siddhi. Its derivative Śivaprakāśam may also be referred to, to know the main principles of the religious philosophy.

The commentary on Śivajñāna Bōdham in Tamil by Sivajñāna Munivar of the 18th century is a standard work. It is a critical work embracing all the standard views of religious philosophy in India and enabling the student to arrive at the correct views of the Śaiva Siddhānta Philosophy.

To know the substance of the philosophic system and the scheme of religious life prescribed in it, two short and succinct works of the

fourteen śāstras in Tamil, maybe read with advantage. The first is Tiruvaruṭpayan, a work of ten chapters of ten couplets each and the other is Uṇmai Viḷakkam of 54 stanzas of veṇba metre. The second is catechysmal in form.

Four Tamil saints Sambandar, Appar, Sundarar, and Māṇikkavācakar are specially remembered as the four teachers of the religion. They revived and re-established the religious practices, especially the Temple worship, among the common mass and were influential leaders, at a time when Tamilnādu came to be gripped under the influence of the ascetic missionaries of Jainism and Buddhism. They reclaimed the people and brought them back to the Śaiva fold. The first two were contemporaries and they lived the life divine during the middle of the 7th century. Sundarar of the eighth century followed the footsteps of these two teachers, established the religion on historical grounds by singing the unique hymn known as *Tiruttonda-t-tokai* and extended his services to the western parts of the Tamil land as well.

The unique work of Saint Māṇikkavācakar, Tiruvācakam, forms part of the 8th book of Śaiva-t-Tirumuraikal. It is a classic work of international fame, well known for its depth of devotion, religious insight and spiritual experience. Another work of Saint Māṇikkavācakar is Tirucciṅṅambalakkōvaiyār, which forms the latter part of the 8th book. It is a great work of inimitable poetic beauty on the topic of love in its purest form, depicting its various stages. The work consists of 400 stanzas reflecting not only the idealised secular love, but also the love of the individual self for the divine which brings out the divine mercy and coalesce with it, resulting in divine bliss. It is described by Saint Kumaraguruparar of the Dharmapuram Adheenam, 'a literary piece of divine illumination saturated with earthly love (Kāmaṁ cāṇṇa Jñāna-p-panuval) '.

Historical background of the Tamil treatise Śivajñāna Bōdham

When over emphasis came to be laid on Sanskrit works with the various commentaries on the Brahma sūtras, Meykandār of the early 13th century came on the scene like the rising Sun. He produced the basic work on Śaiva Siddhānta known as Śivajñāna Bōdham of 12 aphorisms of 40 lines. He pioneered the holy line of the preceptors

called the Śaiva Santāna acāryas who produced great philosophic works in Tamil by way of elucidation of Śivajñāna Bōdham and preserved the traditional religious practices. The fourth among them Saint Umāpati, the author of Sivaprakācam and Tiruvarutpayan was also a Sanskrit writer. He has written a commentary on Pauṣkara, an Upāgama. He has also collected about 100 Sanskrit ślōkas of Āgamas and arranged them into an authoritative work on Śaiva Siddhānta. The work is called Śataratna Sangraha.

We are mainly interested in Meykandar who turned the minds of the scholars from dispute about words to discernment of things. He has followed the footsteps of the Tamil teachers while adhering to the Sanskrit tradition. Sivajñāna Bōdham was preceded by two Tamil works on Śaiva Siddhānta. They are Tiruvundiyār and Tirukkālīruppaḍiyār of the 12th century. These two works mostly refer to the Tamil scriptures and were designed to enlighten the disciple on the special or true nature of the three categories God, Self and the principles of bondage.

A comparative study of Śivajñāna Bōdham with the Brahma sūtras in Sanskrit will make one conclude that the former is a revision or replacement of the latter confining its scope only to the more important questions of Philosophy, without chaining itself to any written work so that a clearer perspective of the synthesis of Truth might be given irrespective of the language in which it is clothed.

Bird's eye view of the system

1. *Fundamental concepts* : The three categories recognized by the system are God, the selves and the principles of bondage. God is the Supreme Spirit, self-existent and self-knowing. He is untainted and unaffected by the changing nature which He controls and governs. He is the main support (Adiṣṭāna kārāṇa) of the other two categories. In the words of Tiruvalluvar He is the *Cārpu*. He may be called the Absolute in the sense that He includes all other entities within His expanse and has the entire economy of the dispensation under His control, while yet free from being affected by the changes. He is full of love and grace and informs and redeems the individual selves.

He is inseparable with His sentient potency which may be called the consciousness-Force or cit-sakti. The relation between God

and His consciousness-Force is generally indicated by the relation between the human body and the hand. The relation in Sanskrit is indicated by the term *tādātmya* ; to use a Tamil word it may be expressed by *onran irumai* (The potential difference). This relation may be compared to that between the magnet and its field of attractive and repulsive forces. They may also be compared to the Sun and its field of attractive and radiant forces. The sun has all its planets confined to its field and keeps them under its control. Similarly the Supreme Spirit is the mainstay of the two other categories and keeps them under its control and influence. In fact the whole universe is designed, controlled and activated by God in view of the emancipation of the infinite Selves. This, He does with His inseparable power of grace, *tādātmya Śakti*.

The individual selves are infinite, sentient beings, requiring to be informed and energised by the consciousness-Force of God. Though they are self-conscious, their potencies are covered with and limited by the innate, pre-cosmic defilement called *āṇava*. It is the spiritual dirt which is removable. For the removal of this innate evil, God has undertaken to create the universe and bestow on the bound selves the psycho physical organism called body, and the environment. Thus the bound selves have been placed in the orbit of birth and death in Nature, subject to her inexorable laws.

Metaphysically bondage consists of three principles. The original spiritual dirt called *āṇava* is the root dirt (*mūla mala*). It is comparable to the original sin or Satan of the Judaic theology. Nature and her material cause *māyā* is the counterforce actuated by God in order to release the selves from the clutches of the evil principle. The moral law that governs the selves when they undergo birth and death, being in conjunction with the bodies and reacting with the environment is called the deeds of the selves.

2. *The pilgrimage of the self*: The chief aim in life is to get release from the bonds and to enjoy the sunshine of the presence of God. Technically these two aims are called the fruits and are described as *pāśa vīdu* and *Śivappēru*. This may be likened unto the detachment of a green fruit from the branch of a tree (or a creeper), when it becomes mature and falls to the ground and identifies itself with it. The earth which is the mainstay of the tree as well as the green fruit is God. The tree (or creeper) which grows on the earth

being sustained by it is the natural world. The green fruit which attaches itself to the tree (or creeper) being sustained by the essence of the earth, received through the tree (or creeper) is the individual self. This is the state of birth.

When the fruit becomes fully ripened, it detaches itself from the tree (or the creeper) gets itself attached to the earth under the influence of the gravitational force which is inherent to the earth. This is the state of release. The gravitational force is the consciousness-Force of God.

This figure is expressed in a Vēdic mantra which is commonly repeated by all the Hindus. It is :

Tryambakam yajā muhē sugandhim puṣṭivardhanam !
Urvārukam iva bandhanāt mrutyor mukṣiya ma' mrtāt !!

It means, ' We worship Śiva with the three eyes, who has the natural sweet fragrance and who increases our health. May we become free from bondage without tears as a cucumber becomes free from its creeper when it matures, but let us not get away from God, the immortality.'

Substance of the aphorisms of Śivajñāna Bōdham

GENERAL SECTION

Aphorism I: Existence of Primal Being, the purpose of creation and the existence of the evil principle, Āṇava.

The world, which is conceived as He, She and It, undergoes three changes, Appearance, sustenance and dissolution. So it is an entity, having an efficient cause that makes it appear. It should appear from the Agent of dissolution, so as to become free from impurity, the principle of individuation. Hence logicians will say that the Agent of dissolution (alone) is the Primal Being.

Aphorism II: Existence of the acquired bonds māyā and karma ; the nature of Primal Being as the agent of five cosmic functions. Existence of the consciousness-force of the Supreme.

The primal Being is non-separable from the selves, being one with them, different from them and causing them to move so that they

may undergo deaths and births ceaselessly, experiencing the fruits of their two deeds. Thus the primal Being is in implicit union with Its consciousness-force, which moves the world.

Aphorism III : Existence of the selves.

As it negates itself, as it speaks of my body, as it knows the functions of the five senses, as it knows of the happenings in the dream when the senses are inactive, as it has no experience or activity in sleep and sound sleep, as it becomes conscious when caused to know, there exists a self in the body, an instrument constituted by the effects of māyā.

Of the eight theories seven are expounded in the third aphorism and the eighth in the fourth Aphorism by the concessional clause. The seven theories are that the self is an entity, it is other than the gross-body, five senses, subtle-body, vital air, the Primal Being and the totality of all these elements. The eighth one is that it is other than the inner sensoria.

Aphorism IV : State of loneliness (Kēvala), the special and general natures of Innate Impurity (Sahaja mala or Āṇava), general nature of the self.

Though the self is not one of the inner faculties, being devoid of awareness, it is associated with them like a king with his ministers, and has five states of consciousness.

Aphorism V : State of Association (Sakala) : the nature of acquired bonds included in Tirōdāna.

Though the skin, mouth, eye, nose (and ear) perceive their objects only through the will of the self, yet they cannot objectify the self. In the same manner, the selves are conscious of their objects only through the grace of the Supreme, though they are not aware of the Supreme. They are active like the iron-filings in the mere presence of the magnet. Like the magnet the Supreme causes changes in other principles, it itself remaining changeless and unchangeable.

Aphorism VI : State of purity : the special nature of the Primal Being.

If He be the object of knowledge, He is Asat (changeable) ; if He be unknowable, He is non-existent. So the great who take their

constant stand on their spiritual experience say that He is neither ; but is Śiva-sat, (cit-sat, spiritual reality), for the reason that He is unknowable by pāśa and paśu Jñānas but knowable by Śiva-Jñāna, wisdom granted by divine grace.

SPECIAL SECTION

Aphorism VII : Special nature of the self.

As in the presence of Sat (unchangeable and unchanging) all are not existent objectively, Sat cannot see things. Asat has no intelligence and cannot know. So the self, which is neither sat nor Asat, knows both, with both, having its being in both the categories.

(In the state of bondage, the self knows the world, through the worldly instruments, being inseparable from the world ; in freedom it knows the Supreme, through its Light of Grace, identifying itself with the Supreme).

Aphorism VIII : Realizing the self's true nature through Light of Grace.

When the Primal Being appears as the master because of the meritorious practices of the self and enlightens it, 'Thou hast lost consciousness of thy true nature, being brought up in company with the savage senses,' the self leaves their company and immediately reaches Hara's feet.

(Some perfected selves attain perfection at the listening of the words of the master itself : others reach perfection only by steps : the steps follow :)

Aphorism IX : Contemplation of the words of the master.

Let the self by spiritual vision discover in its own self the Lord, who cannot be known either to the imperfect consciousness of the self or to its consciousness aroused by the bondage. When the self abandons the world of evolutes of Māyā as a quickly passing mirage, the light of grace rises like a coolshade. To keep the spiritual vision intact : it will ponder the Letters five in the manner prescribed.

(The prescription implied in the aphorism is that the bondage should be abandoned and the Lord should be meditated on in itself

through the light of grace : hence the letters five reduce to three Śivāya or yavasi.)

Aphorism X : Release of bonds-experiencing the state of grace.

If the self identifies with the Supreme even as the Supreme has done so in the state of bondage, and abides in His service, impurity along with the māyā and powerful kanma passes away.

Aphorism XI : State of union.

Even like the self that sees by making the eye see, the Supreme sees and makes the self see. So in unforgetting love, the self reaches the feet of Hara.

Aphorism XII : The habit of the released selves.

The released self washes away the Impurity that prevents it from reaching the feet of the Supreme which are like the blown red lotus flower, keeps in the company of the released selves that love the Lord, and worships as Hara Himself the habit of those who abound in devotion after ridding of delusion and His shrine.

Life of Sivajñāna Munivar, the author of Māpādiyam

India is well-reputed for its literature and grammar from very early times both in Tamil and Sanskrit. In the north there is mount Kailas where Lord Śiva is supposed to reside permanently with His spouse, Uma, the divine wisdom personified. In the South there is what is called Podiyil, the abode of Agastiya the Tamil sage, who is the very equal of Lord Śiva because of his union with Him.

There lived some two hundred years ago, in a small town named Vikrama Singapuram, in Pandi nādu in the South, a happy couple of the names *Ānandā-k-kūttar* and *mayilammaiyār* of the Śaiva community. The place is very near the well known sacred town Pāvanāsam, on the slopes of the podiyil. The family of the couple is reported to be blessed with a boon from the sage Agastiya that it will have, belonging to it, scholars gifted with the Lord's grace for seven generations. This couple was blessed with a child, Mukkaḷā-linga, so that the Śaiva Religious tradition might flourish as a result of the penance and meritorious deeds of Tamil land.

The dutiful parents paid utmost care in rearing the child, healthy, wealthy and wise. When the child was five years of age, he was sent

to the traditional school. One day when the child was returning home for midday meal, he sighted some Tampirāns of Tiruvāvaḍuturai math who were clad in brownish red cloths, and invited them to his house to have their meals. At that time his father was absent. But the mother appreciated the religious feelings of her child and treated the monks with due veneration and sent them back on their pilgrimage. Ānanda-k-kūttar on knowing the religious wisdom of his young son, appreciated him. The child expressed a desire to accompany the monks, and the parents respected the feelings of the child, and were glad to send Mukkaḷālingar along with the monks of the Ādhīnam. His intention was that he should learn the spiritual wisdom by joining the religious order of the Śaiva-ādhīnam and be of service to the religious community of the South. It should be imagined how the religious parents would have felt being caught up between the horns of dilemma and how their religious sense of duty got the upper hand.

The Tampirāns, along with the young disciple, Mukkaḷālingar went to Sucīndram, where there is a branch of Tiruvāvaḍuturai Ādhīnam math, presided over by a teacher named Pinvēlappa dēsikar, who received the young disciple who came along with the aged Tampirāns. He initiated him and took care of his learning, spiritual and secular, both in Tamil as well as Sanskrit. After some years closely observing his behaviour and good conduct and faultless learning, the head of the math gave him Śaiva Sannyāsa and the wisdom initiation which is known as Nirvāṇa dīkṣā along with the name Śivajñānam.

Śivajñāna munivar was a scholar, poet, grammarian, logician, linguist and in short a versatile genius. He widely travelled throughout the length and breadth of the Tamil Nādu and when he laid his mortal remains at Tiruvāvaḍuturai on 20-4-1785, he was only 32 and he had the following twenty nine works to his credit.

Works of Śivajñāna Munivar

Religious and philosophical works

1. Śivajñāna Mapāḍiam.
2. A paraphrase of Śivajñāna bōdham with grammatical notes.
3. Paraphrase of Śivajñāna Siddhi.

4. Siddhānta prakāśika (a Tamil translation of Sanskrit work by Sarvātma śambhu).
5. A refutation of a commentary on Sivajñāna siddhi by Gñānaprakāśar.
6. Refutation of the interpretation of stanza beginning with 'Ennai ippavattil'.
7. A protection like a mailcoat on the meaning of the word 'Eḍuttu'.
8. Translation of five Ślōkas of Haradatta.
9. Śiva tattva vivēkam (translation of the work of Appaiya dīkṣita).
10. Refutation of the refutation of a work on the tradition of Siddhānta.

On Tamil Grammar

1. A commentary of the introductory stanza and the first aphorism of Tolkāppiyam.
2. Ilakkana viḷakka-c-cūṛāvaḷi.
3. Corrections on the commentary on Nannul by Sankara Namaccivāyar.

Poetics (literary)

1. Kānchi-p-purāṇa -I canto
2. Sōmēśar mutumozhi veṇpā
3. Kuḷattūr pattiṟru ppattu andādi
4. Ilacai-p- patiṟru ppattu andādi
5. Kalaicai-p-patiṟru ppattu andādi
6. A decad on Ānanda rudrēśar of Kānchi
7. Ānanda Kaḷippu of Tiruvēkambar
8. Pillai-t-tamizh on Senkazhunir Vināyakar of Kalaicai
9. Pillai-t-tamizh on Amutāmbikai of Kuḷattūr
10. A decad on Akilāndēsvari of Rājavalli puram
11. Andādi on Tiruvēkampar
12. Andādi on Tirumullaivāyil
13. A series of names of Tiruttondar
14. A garland on Pancākkara dēśikar
15. Answer to possible doubts on the first stanza of Kamba rāmāyaṇa

Logic

1. A Tamil translation of a work of logic by Annam battar with its commentary.

Life and work of Meykaṇḍār

Meykaṇḍār is famous as the author of the Tamil Śivajñāna bōdham and its succinct analysis called vārtikam. He is also known as the first among the four linear preceptors of Śaiva Siddhānta tradition in South India. He gave the logical basis to the school of thought of Śaiva Siddhānta, that prevailed in South India. He was of the early 13th century, if not earlier. It is widely accepted that he was well known in the year 1235 from epigraphical evidence. The story of his birth and initiation is very interesting.

The stretch of land that intervened in olden days between Toṇḍai nāḍu and Cōzha nāḍu was known as Nadu nāḍu (the land of the midst). It is also known by the alternative name Tirumunai-p-pāḍi nāḍu. It is to the South West of the present Chingleput district comprising of parts of North and South Arcōṭs. The land was sanctified already by the birth of the two Śaiva Teacher-Saints, Appar and Sundarar.

There, in Tiruppenṇakaṭam, lived a chieftain named Acchyuta Kaḷappālar. He was gifted with all material blessings of this world, but not a child. One day he went to Turaiyūr where his religious teacher, Sakala āgama paṇḍitar lived, to receive his blessings. The teacher worshipped at the feet of Lord Śiva and asked the disciple to place a thread in between the palm leaves of a book which had on its pages impressed the Tēvāram hymns. The purpose of the teacher was to know the will of God from the meanings of the stanza of Tēvāram that made its appearance before him.

To the welcome surprise of both, the stanza of Tirujñāna Sambandar on Tiruveṅkāṭu commencing with the words, 'pēy aḍaiyā ; piriv(u) eytum' came to be sighted. The meaning of the stanza is as follows : 'Persons who worship Lord Śiva, the partner of Umā of smooth arms like bamboos, after bathing in the three tanks at Veṅkāṭu will not be approached by evil spirits : they will leave them (even if they had been possessed). They will be blessed with child and will have their hearts desires fulfilled. They need not

entertain any doubt, for they will not be touched by the evil efforts of demerits '.

Immediately the Teacher asked his disciple to go to Tiruveṅkātu with his spouse and carry out the worship. While the Kaḷappālar was performing the worship, the Lord of Tiruveṅkātu told him in his dream that though he had not the good fortune to have a child in that birth, because of his implicit faith in the utterings of Sambandar, he would be granted a child even like the saint himself. The chieftain finished his vow of worship and returned to his native place.

In course of time a male child was born to him and it was being reared with unique care and endearment by the family, the relatives and the citizens alike.

Soon the uncle of the child took him to Tiruveṅṇainallūr along with his mother and reared him there. One day when the child was playing in the open, a certain Saint Parañcōti from mount Kailās came down and imparted the divine wisdom which he inherited from Lord Śiva and named the child Meykaṇḍān after his master Satyajñāna darśini and left the place.¹

Meykandar meditated on the wisdom conveyed to him seated in front of Pollāp Pillaiyār in the South-west shrine at Aruṭuṟai² and reduced his thoughts³ to writing. It took the form of Sivajñāna bōdham of twelve aphorisms, together with two more stanzas forming the introduction to the work. The stanzas are one in praise of Lord Gaṇēśa and the other apologetic in veṅpā metre.

Then the author supplied an analysis to the twelve aphorisms in prose and poetry, and began to teach the content of the work to the saintly souls that approached him for enlightenment.

¹ A History of Indian Philosophy by Dasgupta, Vol. V, p. 11.

² Tradition says that Tirunandi knew the truth from Lord Śiva of Mount Kailās. From Nandi Sanatkumāra and from Sanatkumāra, Satyajñāna darśini. Satyajñāna Darśini communicated the truth to Parañcōti. The four teachers from Tirunandi are called the preceptors of the internal line, whereas the four teachers, Meykaṇḍār, Aruṇandi, Maraijñāna Sambandar and Umāpati Śivam are said to belong to the external line of preceptors. The special importance of the line of preceptors is that they had conveyed the Spiritual Truth of the scriptural works in a synthetic form free from the limitations of time, space and person.

³ Aruṭuṟai is the name of the Śiva's temple at Thiruveṅṇai nallūr.

Sakalāgama Paṇḍitar himself was a well-known teacher of Śaiva Siddhānta lore at Turaiyur. He noticed, in course of time, that a number of his students themselves absented from his classes to attend the classes held by Meykaṇḍār at Tiruveṇṇai nallūr. So he became curious and paid a visit to his disciples at Tiruveṇṇai nallūr. To his disappointment he did not find Meykaṇḍār among those that welcomed him. He then paid a visit to the place where Meykaṇḍār was conducting his classes.

At that time, the second topic of the fourth aphorism was being discussed. The subject was āṇava, the innate impurity of the selves. The Pandit felt it beneath his dignity to sit at the feet of Meykaṇḍār and listen to the progress of the lesson. He questioned the child, while standing, what the nature of āṇava was.

The real teacher in the form of a child cast his redeeming look at the person of the aged pandit, and pointed his finger at his standing posture. The pandit realised that it was Lord Śiva Himself come in the form of a child to teach him the truth, and prostrated before him. He simultaneously felt that the egoism which at first made him think of the form of the child only ignoring the Śivahood in him, was the effect of the root impurity āṇava.

The master Meykaṇḍār placed his feet on the head of Sakalāgama paṇḍitar (a person well-versed in all the religious lore) gave him the name of initiation Arulnandi, after the first disciple of Lord Śiva, and answered various questions asked by Arulnandi pertaining to the book learning he had previously. These questions and the answers furnished by Meykaṇḍār are expressed by Sri Arulnandi in the form of a philosophical work of twenty stanzas called Irupā irupaṭtu (a work of twenty stanzas of 2 kinds). The first verse of the book conveys the following meaning : 'If persons approached Meykaṇḍār with the idea that He is the Lord Śiva come to remove the impurity of the selves hiding his eye on the forehead and the blue colour on the neck, they will immediately realize the eternal bliss within and will attain union with God'.

Sri Arulnandi became the Senior most of the disciples of Meykaṇḍār. After listening to the teaching of Meykaṇḍār, and at his command, Arulnandi wrote the work Sivajñāna Siddhi, as the secondary to Śivajñāna Bōdham. Siddhi consists of two parts the

Parapakkam and the Supakkam consisting of 301 and 328 verses respectively. The first part, Para pakkam, is an elaboration of the meaning of the apologetic verse of Sivajñāna Bōdham. It deals with the various outer schools of thought under fourteen heads. Each head gives the ideas as narrated by the school and is followed by its refutation from the point of view of Śaiva Siddhānta. It should be noted Arulnandi has drawn freely from Maṇimēkalai in narrating the various schools of thought in Para pakkam. The second part Supakkam is a commentary on the twelve aphorisms as indicated by Meykaṇḍār's analysis. Here he has drawn freely from Sivāgamas. Thus the essence of Sanskrit scriptural learning is presented in Siddhiyar.

Arulnandi succeeded Meykaṇḍār. Maraijñāna Sambandar of Tiruppenṇākātam became the third in the line of the preceptors. While Maraijñānasambandar was at Chidambaram, he chose Umāpati, one of the learned Dīkṣitars as his foremost disciple. The third teacher is not on record to have composed any new work. But the fourth Saint Umāpati wrote eight Siddhānta works besides many in Tamil. He has also commented in Sanskrit on an upāgama named Pouṣkara.

One of the disciples of Meykaṇḍār, Manavācakam katantār, who remained in Tiru Adhikai (modern Paṇruti) produced a work named Uṇmai Viḷakkam of 54 stanzas, which gives in a nutshell the traditional spiritual practice of this line of preceptors. There had already been two works in Tamil on Śaiva-Siddhānta, Thiru Undiyār and Tiru-k-kaḷirruppaḍiyār even before the time of Meykaṇḍār. All these fourteen works are collected together and are called the fourteen treatises of canonised Śaiva-Siddhānta works.

The relative merits of the various spiritual authoritative works can be gleaned from the following Tamil verse :

Vēdam paśu ātanpāl meyyāgamam nalvar
 ŌtumTamizh ātanin ulluṟu Ney—bōdhamiku
 Neyyin uṟu suvaiyām Nīlveṇṇai Meykaṇḍān
 ceytaTamizh nūlin tīram

The vēda is cow; cow's milk is the Sivāgamas; Tēvāram, and Tiru-vācakam, the Tamil works of the four Teachers, are the ghee obtained

from the Āgamas. If we estimate the nature of Sivajñāna Bōdham which was produced in Tamil by Meykaṇḍār, it should be adjudged the taste of the ghee. Meykaṇḍār is supposed to have spent his time at Tiruveṇṇai nallūr and attained the feet of Lord Śiva in the Tamil month Aippasi in the star of Swāti (i.e. about the day of Deepavali) the day when the moon is seen opposite to the constellation of Swāti.

The math at Tiruveṇṇai nallūr is under the administration of the Tiruvāvaduturai Ādhinam.

FOREWORD

Sivajñāna Bōdham is the basic work of the Śaiva-Siddhānta School of thought. The origin of the school is lost in the midst of the past. It has been established that the worship of Lord Śiva was prevalent even as early as the Indus valley civilization. The school of thought has embraced all the good points of almost all the other religious schools. It was developed and perfected by the sages, saints and seers of the Tamil land.

It is the key from the point of view of a Śaiva-Siddhāntin to an effective study and proper understanding of the spiritual experiences and teachings of the Vēdas, the Śivāgamas and the Tamil scriptures.

The author of Śivajñāna Bōdham is saint Meykaṇḍār, an infant seer, who flourished in the early parts of the 13th century. It stands to his inestimable credit that he inaugurated the renaissance of the Śaiva-philosophy and put it on a sound logical foundation with epistemological basis. It is a spiritual legacy that has come down to us directly from the author and adds to the glory of the Tamil language.

This religious philosophy is theistic, realistic and pluralistic in nature and in it the unity of the various factors is established by organization. It recognizes not only the inherited authority of the verbal testimony but also the intellectual authority of perception and inference. While recognizing the verbal testimony, it considers the vēdas and the vēdānta as the general ones whereas the Śivāgamas are considered to be the special ones. The relation between the vēdas and the Śivagāmas is like that of an aphorism and its commentary. Without the commentary the aphorism may mean anything to a man as per his liking. It is only the commentary that restricts the meaning to the context and to the purpose and intention behind the expression.

Any student who genuinely applies himself to a study and understanding of Śivajñāna Bōdham with its commentary will find therein the long lost synthesis of truth in the field of philosophy and religion. It is to be noted that the Tamil scriptures are included in the term Śivāgamas.

The term Vēdānta, referred to herein denotes the classic upanishads that form the essence of the vēdas. It has no reference to either the vēdānta sūtras by Bādarāyaṇa or their commentaries by Śrīkanta, Śankara, Rāmānuja, Madhva and others.

After the four great teachers of Śaiva religion, (Sambandar and others) who flourished before the 8th century A.D., several currents of thought flowed into the Tamil land and swayed the minds of the people. The rival systems of philosophic thought propounded by the several commentators of the Brahmasūtra created confusion in the minds of the public. The idealistic monism based on the Vēdic text 'Sadēva saumyēdam agra āsīd ; ekamēvā-dvītiyam' advanced by the followers of Śankarācārya challenged the high order of the spiritual life of the Tamil saints and their teachings. Although the distinct expression of the essential principles of the Śaiva Siddhānta system could be found in the sublime devotional lyrics of the Tamil saints, they could not be easily perceived. Nor could they be maintained in the absence of an exposition of their truths in a scientific manner against the opposing claims that were armed with logical methods of attack, armoured with quotations from Vēdic texts. It was at such a period in the religious History of South India that Sri Meykaṇḍā Dēvar made his appearance like the rising sun of spiritual splendour, dispelling the darkness of ignorance and confusion in the minds of the people. It was given to the genius of the infant-saint to supply the long felt need of a scientific treatment of the principles of Śaiva-Siddhānta religion and Philosophy.

The life of Śrī Meykaṇḍār is very interesting. He was born of a chieftain by name Acchuta Kaḷappālar of Peṇṇākadam, a place 16 km from Mudu-kunṇam (Vruddācalam) in the South Arcot district. The Kaḷappālar was gifted with many blessings of this world but was not blessed with a child. So he went to his family priest at Turaiyūr for advice. The teacher prayed for enlightenment, opened the book of Tēvāram and sighted a beautiful stanza by Saint Sambandar in praise of the Lord of Tiruveṇkāḍu. The stanza indicated that a wor-

shipper at the feet of the Lord of Tiruvenkāḍu after a bath in the sacred tanks there would be gifted with a child and there was no doubt about it. Encouraged by this divine prophecy, the Kaḷappālar proceeded with his spouse to Tiruvenkāḍu and offered prayers to the Lord Swetavanēśvara.

One day Lord Śiva appeared in his dream and said, ' Though thou hast not the necessary good deeds to be blessed with a child in this birth, yet thou shalt be blessed with one like Sambandar as thou hast put implicit faith in his songs '. Later on a child was born to the happy couple, which was named Svetavana Perumāḷ after the name of the Lord.

After some time the maternal uncle of the child took him to his native place Tiruvenṇainallūr and brought him up there with love and care.

The child was completing his second year. Parancōti Munikal of Śrī Kailās was proceeding to Mount Podiyil to see the sage Agastya. He felt as he was passing Tiruvenṇainallūr a mystic hindrance to his journey, and being intuitively directed by the Lord, came to the child, touched him with the spark of divine grace and imparted the spiritual wisdom which had come down to him from Lord Śiva.

The child that was thus initiated was given the name *Meykaṇḍa Dēva* so as to be an adequate description of his attainment of spiritual perfection as well as an indication of his spiritual heredity. The name Meykaṇḍār is a Tamil equivalent of Satyajñāna Darśini, the name of his spiritual forefather.

The wisdom taught in Sivajñāna Bōdham is supposed to have passed through Thiru Nandi Dēva, Sanat kumāra, Satyajñāna Darśini and Paranjōti before it reached Meykaṇḍa Dēva. Meykaṇḍa Dēva then realized the spiritual truth imparted to him in the presence of Pollā-p-pillayār (Lord Geṇēśa in the Arulurāi Temple of Tiruvenṇainallūr). Then he formulated the truth in twelve aphorisms in Tamil and added two more stanzas, one in praise of Lord Pollā-p-Pillaiyār as the invocatory one, and the other an apologetic, as foreword to the work. He also added to the aphorisms a commentary known as Vārttikam which is a skeleton of the dissertation on the main issues of each aphorism. The dissertation on a particular issue consists

of the proposition maintained, the reason that establishes the proposition, and the illustrations. He instructed his disciples and initiated them into the mysteries of the spirit. The chief among his disciples was Aruṇandi Śivācārya who was no other than the Sakalāgama Pandita, the family priest of Acchuta Kaḷappālar.

The first meeting of the Sakalāgama Pandita with the infant seer has a fascinating account. Sakalāgama Pandita himself was a priest well-reputed for his wide and deep learning. He had been teaching the scriptural literature to his disciples. But in course of time his disciples one by one disappeared from his classes. He came to know that they were attracted to the child at Tiruveṇṇainallūr. So he proposed to go to that place to see the child. He was given a grand reception by the residents of the place. All but Meykaṇḍār came to welcome him and paid their respects. The Pandit went to the place where Meykaṇḍa Dēvar was teaching the path of wisdom with the work Śivajñāna Bōdham to his disciples. At that time, Meykaṇḍār was expounding the nature of the evil principle called Āṇava. The Pandit at once asked Meykaṇḍār what the nature of Āṇava was. The infant saint, by way of reply promptly pointed his finger at Sakalāgama Pandit himself.

The implication is that his attitude itself revealed egoism that is caused by Āṇava. Instantly the pride of the Pandit was humbled and he prostrated before the child and sincerely prayed for spiritual wisdom. Śrī Meykaṇḍa Dēva initiated him in the truth and gave him the name of initiation, Aruṇandi. After instructing him with Śivajñāna Bōdham, he commanded him to produce a treatise expounding the ideas contained in Śivajñāna Bōdham. Aruṇandi produced the work called Śivajñāna Siddhiyār.

Sivajñāna Siddhi consists of two parts. The first part called *Parapakkam* is an exposition of the apologetic stanza of the primary and it consists of 301 Tamil stanzas. The second part called *Supakkam* consisting of 328 stanzas, is the exposition of the meaning of the twelve aphorisms as per the conclusions of the Śivāgamas.

The work has been conceived so as to form two separate works as well. Both the parts have separate chapters of introduction, but has the same stanza in praise of Lord Gaṇēśa as invocatory. He had also composed Irupā Irupahtu in praise of his master which

mainly prays Meykaṇḍār for enlightenment on the various riddles that are involved in understanding the path of wisdom as chalked out in Śaiva-Siddhānta.

A line of preceptors followed Śrī Meykaṇḍār and Aruḷnandi which caused the establishment of the two main Śaiva ādhīnams at Tiruvāvaḍuturai and Dharmapuram.

The fourth in the line was Saint Umāpati who has written eight Tamil works on Śaiva-Siddhānta, besides a number of other works. Among the other works his Sanskrit commentary on the upāgama of Pauṣkara, and another work in the form of an anthology of Āgama slokas called Śataratna Sangraha deserve special mention. The third in the line was Maraijñāna Sambandar who has not produced any new work.

There were already two authoritative works on Śaiva Siddhanta before the advent of Meykaṇḍār. They were Tiruvundiyar and Tiru-k-kalī ṛrup-paḍiyār. These two works preceded, Śivajñāna Bōdham of Meykaṇḍār.

Śivajñāna Siddhi and Irupa Irupahtu of Aruḷnandi, Uṇmai Viḷakkam of Manavācakam Kaḍaṇṭār and the eight works of Umāpati are collectively called the fourteen Śaiva-Siddhānta Śāstras. Manavācakam kaḍaṇṭār was one of the forty-nine disciples of Meykaṇḍār.

A succinct account of the philosophy of the school is necessary. Three categories are recognised by this school of thought. They are God, the individual selves and the three principles of bondage.

God is one and is of the nature of immutable consciousness-bliss. He is both transcendent and all-pervasive. His pervasiveness makes us to conceive of Him as one in two, He the bliss and His form and quality which is His conscious potency. This conscious potency manifests as grace, omniscience and omnipotence. The foundational nature of God is described by the Upanisadic term *advitīyam*. The term means according to Meykaṇḍār inseparable togetherness. Vijñān bikṣu of the later parts of 16th century would like to explain the meaning of the term by the word *avibāga* (non-separableness). The other two categories are dependent on God for their activity but they cannot be derived from Him either as His products or as His mere appearance.

The selves are infinite in number : the essential difference between the knowing entities God and the self is that God knows all things at all times without identifying Himself with them, whereas the self knows one thing at a time by identifying itself with the nature of the object.

Bondage consists of two opposite forces. One is the original evil principle called Āṇava, which may be compared to the original sin of the semitic religions and another its opposite which is called māyā and its products. Māyā is the potential from which creation of the world is made in order that the selves may be redeemed from the effects of the original evil principle, Āṇava. Āṇava effects the individual selves by causing complete ignorance when they are not influenced by the products of māyā, and when they are influenced by māyā, it causes the egoistic tendency of I and mine. The products of māyā are usually counted as four in number, the body, the various evolutes that act as instruments of knowledge and action (having the body as the locus), the locus on which the body moves and subsists, and things of the world which are experienced by the self.

The experience of the world is of the form of pleasure, pain or indifference and this is both the effect and the cause of the two deeds of the selves, in the form of their thought, word and action characterised by egoism. This double edged tool of experience makes the self become wiser and truly enlightened as to the existence and nature of not only the world but also those of the individual selves and the Supreme Self.

In course of time, as the clutches of the evil principle Āṇava becomes loosened, the individual self grows in maturity and realizes the complete help that is provided by the Supreme Being. As the realization grows, the attachment of the self to the world becomes transformed into the real attachment or love towards the Supreme.

The help that apparently came to the self through the world was really caused by the supreme. The individual self is like the green fruit of a tree that attaches itself to the tree so long as it receives the sap of the tree and ripens. But once when it becomes ripened it detaches itself and falls to the earth (as it is always under the influence of the gravitational force). In fact the earth is the mainstay for both the tree and the fruit. It supplies to the fruit its essence and makes it grow and ripen.

This illustration well accords with the working of the categories recognised by Śaiva-Siddhānta. The earth is God ; the fruit is the individual self and the tree is the world of Nature. The nourishment which is derived from the moisture and earth and supplied by the tree to the fruit is the screening power of God that works towards the maturation of the self through the products of māyā and the deeds. The ripened fruit which detaches itself from the tree and falls to the ground is the enlightened self that completely identified itself with God and enjoys divine bliss.

In this connection it will contribute towards clarity if a popular and efficacious mantra in Sanskrit is quoted and its English translation is given :

Traiambakam yajāmuḥē sugandhim puṣṭivardhanam !
Urvārukam iva bandanāt mṛtyoh muksiya ; ma' mṛtat !!

We worship Lord Śiva, who has three eyes, who emits sweet fragrance and who increases our health. Even as cucumber detaches itself freely from its binding creeper, may He detach us from all the worldly bonds ; but let Him not separate us from Him, who is Immortality itself.

The commentary which is given here in translation is by Śivajñāna Śwāmīgal of Thiruvāvaḍuturai Ādhīnam (1756-1785). It is authoritative and an exhaustive one. It gives all the valid view points of the various topics and their criticism. So it is self explanatory. We have to remember that the commentator is a scholar of both the languages Tamil and Sanskrit, and he is a writer, grammarian, poet, philosopher and critic. Among the works produced by him, which are twenty-nine in number, three belong to the critical study of Tamil grammar, fifteen belong to the literary pieces, one a translation of the system of Vaisēṣika and ten may be classified as works on religion and philosophy.

II. THE WORK PROPER

Introductory stanza

The work Śivajñāna Bōdham purports to be a critical study of the contents of the wisdom portions of the Śivāgamas. Śivāgamas are divided into four parts each, dealing with carya, kriya, yōga and jñāna. Of these parts jñāna pāda constitutes the wisdom portion. For a person who undertakes the study of this work, the following preliminary questions will arise : They are,

(1) What is the use of such a study ? (2) Who are competent for the study ? (3) What is the subject matter of the work ? (4) What important knowledge is the prerequisite for such a study ? (5) What is the name of the work ? (6) What is the jurisdiction of the work ? (7) What is its primary ? and (8) Who is the author of the work ?

The following introductory stanza answers such questions so that the reader may be enthused to make a study of the work. The meaning of the stanza is :—

Unless the sun rises, the human eye cannot perceive things, the darkness that prevents it from seeing things not being dispelled. In a similar manner, in order that the individual self may make an inquiry into the nature and existence of the self, on the basis of its embodiment, become free from darkness and have the mystic experience through the grace of God that is the subject of the grand expression, Nandi gave great Śivajñāna Bōdham to the assembly of great sages.¹ The work has been revealed and commented on by

¹ In the original the expression is 'uraittōn', which may mean one who expressed, or one who commented on. Śivajñāna Munivar has taken the word to mean translated into Tamil and added a brief commentary named, 'vārttikam'. But the author of Sivaprakāśam says that it was Meykaṇḍār who gave expression to the spiritual tradition which came from, the mount Kailas in the name of Śivajñāna Bōdham which excels any other work on spirituality. 'Uyar Śivajñāna Bōdham ceppinar' is his expression.

Svētavana of Tiruvenṇai, which is being watered by the river Pennai. He is known as Meykaṇḍa Dēva who has rejected the falsity of the systems of religious and philosophical knowledge after knowing them to be such, and expounded the truth after perceiving it. He is the chief among the sages who have won over the strong enemy of transmigration and who worship at his feet.

Commentary :

This stanza need not be taken to be redundant simply because the stanza occurring at the end of the work expresses the same meaning. The intention of this introductory stanza is to give at the commencement of the work the same thing that is given at the end. It is with the same intention that Śrī Nārāyaṇa Kantha has given the tradition of the origin of the Āgamas at the beginning of his commentary on Mrgēndra even though the information is supplied by the work itself at the end. There is also an alternative reason for this. This stanza at the commencement says clearly that the work has divided the subject into general and special. This aspect of the work has not been brought out by the stanza at the end of the work, which begins with the word 'Endai Sanatkumaran'. The stanza intended to give this information, has also conveyed other facts which are found expressed in the stanza at the end.²

The term *māyirul* means the thick darkness that spreads out and hides things on the vast expanse of the earth. The expression should be split into the two words 'mā' (great) and 'irul' (darkness). It may also be taken to mean that the external darkness is perishable whereas the spiritual (internal) darkness which indicates by analogy is imperishable. In that case, the expression should be split up into the words 'māy' and 'irul' means perishing darkness. We shall deal with the nature of darkness and its existence in our commentary where we deal with the organ of sight.

²(a) It might be inferred from the commentary that the introductory piece at the beginning is a later addition than the one given at the end. The commentary presupposes this idea.

²(b) The introductory stanza to be of historical value should not be anonymous. The relation of the author of the Introductory with the author of the work should be known. But still the commentator (Śivajñāna Munivar of Tiruvavaduturai adhinam) has not chosen to mention the name of the author of the stanza beginning with the word 'malar talai ulakin'. It may also be noted that even the stanza at the end of the work does not reveal the name of its author. Probably the authors are only *abhiyuktas* i.e., men who appreciated the content of the work.

The stanza has given the attribute '*palar pukazh*' to the word '*Nayiru*' which means the sun. Palar pukazh means that all the religionists who may not agree with respect to their conclusions have unanimously agreed to worship the sun.

The earthly sun rises in the east which is a part of the whole earth and dispels the darkness enshrouding the whole expanse of the earth. Similarly Śivajñāna Bōdham which appears in a chapter of Śaivāgama dispels the internal darkness which is irremovable by the study of the scriptural works belonging to any other religion.

The language used in the introductory stanza is such as to convey the meaning that even as the sun is responsible for the removal of the earthly darkness and for the two kinds of perception, indeterminate and determinate, so also the work Śivajñāna Bōdham removes the internal darkness of the individual self and enables it to have the two kinds of wisdom which arise respectively from inquiry and direct experience. This also implies that as the sun which dispels the external darkness and reveals the wordly things is of twelve kinds ; so also this work which dispels the internal darkness is of twelve kinds with respect to its constituent units, the sutras or aphorisms.

Here the commentator refutes other commentators who have taken God as being referred to by the word Nāyiru (the sun) in the introductory piece. He says that the intention of the introductory stanza is to compare the work on hand to the sun. The comparison of the Sun to God occurs in the work itself which need not be repeated in the introduction. The expression '*īṇḍiya perumpeyark kaḍavul*' means God who is expressed by the grand expression,³ which is the synthesis of all the scriptural wisdom. Here the commentator points out that the grand expression implies not only the known but also the knower and the means of knowing (jñāta, and jñānam). But in actual spiritual experience, the elements of the means of knowing and the knower are merged in the object of experience. So the expression refers to the known alone while referring to the grand expression. The known, i.e., the Lord, which is the chief among the

³ The commentator is of the opinion that Sivajñāna Bōdham was originally in Sāṅskṛit and formed part of the Āgāma Raurava. This part of the Āgāma is generally taken to be Pāśa vimōcana patalam. So in his commentary wherever he desires to explain the suggestive meaning, he brings in the idea as well.

three, is potent enough to absorb the other two factors within its splendour.

The embodiment of the individual self is referred to as a rented house which is the source of all trouble (*arum tuyark kurambai*), to indicate that it is not a permanent habitation. The internal darkness is referred to as darkness inferred (*kaṇ irul*) to distinguish it from the external darkness which is known to the sense of sight. The embodiment implies and includes the organs within and the environment.

The inquiry on the basis of the embodiment and the related things will be of the following form : As the physical body is an inert one there should be an intelligent self within to know and experience pleasures and pains. As the pleasures and pains (experiences) differ from body to body, there are innumerable selves differing from body to body. The intelligent self should have a binding principle which constrains it to be bound up with the inert body. This bondage should be a timeless one and in consequence the selves should have three causal states of awareness namely *kēvala*, *sakala* and *suddha*. It is our daily experience that we have the states of wakefulness, dream, sleep, sound sleep and momentary suspension of life. So it can be inferred that the individual selves undergo daily the five effective states of awareness even while in embodiment. During the wakeful state when the individual self has sense experience, the self has both remembrance and forgetfulness alternating. So even in direct experience the self may be considered to have five states within it.

Since these individual selves are chained to the physical body and have no independence, it is to be inferred that there is a Supreme Being who has brought about the embodiment of the individual selves and directs them. He should be the creator, preserver and the destroyer of the whole of the physical environment. So he should be superior to the three Gods who are assigned only one of these three functions and He should be the director of these gods. He should be free from the entanglement of the physical world, but should be able to activate it with His Intelligence Energy which is one with Him. The material cause of the whole world should be a homogenous potency everlasting and omnipresent, which is indicated by the term *māyā* in the scriptures. The instrumental cause for the creation of the differing embodiment and environment should be the deeds per-

formed by the individual selves. These deeds are known as *karma* or *iruvinaṭ* in scriptures. Since the supreme Being is supposed to perform the three functions of involution, evolution and preservation, He is to be regarded by courtesy as having the three states *laya*, *bhoga* and *adhikara* corresponding to the three functions.

He makes the individual selves experience pleasures and pains through the instrumentality of the embodiment without Himself being soiled by these actions. He can neither be an object of ordinary knowledge nor be a completely unknown entity. He should be experienced in the supra-mental consciousness of the individual self. The principle which experiences Him is the individual self. This is the way in which inference is made from the known objects so as to be in accordance with the scriptural knowledge. The word *self* means both the Supreme Self and the individual self. Hence the nature of both the selves has been dealt with.³

The following is the content of the mystic experience which one has through the grace of God, the subject of grand expression. As a result of the inferential realization of the relative characteristics of oneself and one's master, the self becomes free from the spiritual darkness. As experience is none other than cognitive ingress, the individual self completely depends upon the special scripture which deals with the meaning of the grand expression. Of the three entities which are known in general, experience cannot be attributed to the Supreme Being, which has no cognitive ingress ; nor can it be attributed to the element of bondage, which is inert. It can be attributed to the individual self, for it is only the individual self which can identify itself with the one or the other of the two remaining entities and cognise them. The Upāgama, Sarvajñānōttara tells us that the individual self identifies itself with the object of its cognition. So the individual self alone can have mystic experience. Even as a cleaned cloth has the purity extended throughout its form, so the individual self which is free from the darkness has consciousness which is comparatively all pervasive. As its nature is to identify itself with the thing of its contact, it can be aware of only that thing alone, remaining oblivious to all other things. In this respect the released soul, though considered to be omniscient in comparison with its state of bondage, yet is limited to the Supreme Being which it experiences.

³ C.f. *patyādi Śabdēbhyo*—B.S.

As the individual self cognises things only by identifying itself with its object, it should be noted that it always depends upon a *lighter* (*vyanjaka* or manifest) which causes it to know. Some selves have attained release, while some others are in the process of attaining it and others will attain it. So it is inferred that the potencies of the inner darkness are innumerable, leaving the selves at different duration of times. So the selves which are bound by such potencies too are innumerable. As the individual selves are innumerable, the difference in their characteristics is known from the fact that their faculties of understanding are evolved like a flight of steps according to their innate nature. From this it will be clear that the individual selves have different stages of fruition, and that there are different levels of bondage and release, and that the change from the state of bondage to the state of release is a continuous process. From this it will also be clear as to what is adventitious and what is inherent. As the cognitive potency of the Supreme Being does not identify itself with its objects, it does not require any *lighter* for its manifestation. It is independent and it can know things by itself and cause the selves to know ; it is omniscient. So it is only the Supreme Being, the self of the self, that appears in the form of a true spiritual master before a matured self and points out the distinction between the real friend and foe. (The friend of the self is the Supreme Being whereas the foe is the principle of the threefold bondage)—and releases it from hold of the foe. The sustained penance performed by the individual self enables it to realise the true nature of the spiritual master and his teaching.

When the individual self realizes the foe and the friend as such, it naturally leaves the foe and conjoins the friend. This dependence on the Supreme is effected by the spiritual wisdom, which is called Śivajñāna. This spiritual wisdom will arise when the worldly attachment ceases. This cessation will be perfected by the repetition of what is called the three lettered *spell* known as *mukti pañcākṣara*. When the self submerges its individuality and becomes identified with the supreme it experiences the supreme as the supreme conscious-Bliss. The self approaches the supreme with pure love which is the essence of the divine cognition. In that state, the self is similar to the supreme. A crystal placed in contact with a gem appropriates its lustre and becomes similar to it, but it does not become identical with the gem. In a similar manner, the individual self even in the

state of release continues to be dependent on the Supreme Being. This experiential wisdom which comes to a person through the grace of God is the special characteristic of the selves.

It should be noted that what is called the general nature is that which is attributed to the three entities from the standpoint of bondage. This is adventitious. That which is known to be the characteristic of these entities from the standpoint of the state of release is known as the special or true nature which is inherent. The import of these terms *general and special nature*—used in doctrinal literature and in logical works should be distinguished and understood. In logical works the qualities that are common to a number of things are called general, whereas those that are attributed to particular ones are called special or particular ones. But here, in doctrinal literature, the term general (*podu* in Tamil) is a technical one used in the sense of *tatastha lakṣaṇa* and the term special (*ciṛappu* in Tamil) is equivalent to the technical term *svarūpa lakṣaṇa*. The terms *tatastha* and *svarūpa* are used in Sanskrit philosophical literature.

Śivaprakasam commences with the expression, *conceiving the work with the divisions of PODU and UNMAI*, and concludes at the end with the expression, ‘*We have expounded the nature of bondage and release (petta mutikal madittāmanrē)*. Hence it is clear by the index of *upakrama* and *upasamhāra* (the beginning and the end versions) that *podu* is identical with *petta* (bondage) and *unmai* is identical with *Mukti*. Hence it should be clear that the expression general should refer to the characteristics that are observable during the stage of bondage, whereas the special or true (*unmai*) one should refer to the characteristics that belong to the state of release. One should not confuse the two distinct usages of the terms by the sameness of the form of expression.

Now the question may arise, why should scriptural literature deal with the two kinds of characteristics, general and special. Is it not enough if the special characteristic alone is given? The answer is that it is not enough to give the special characteristics alone. It is said that the path of realization of an individual lies through the various external and internal religions, by observing the rules and regulations prescribed, by performing penances, by learning the various departments of knowledge, the Vēdās and the purāṇas which are held in reverence, and by having a clear knowledge of the import

of the concluding portions of the Vēdās. For a person who has followed all these various courses is reserved what is called the region of Āgamic literature. There too the aspirant approaches the Supreme, going through external worship, then through the worship, demanding physical and mental actions, and then through the internal worship. If such a person lives the life of Śivajñāna, i.e., worships the divine with pure wisdom, he attains the feet of God. So a person reaches the zenith of the state of release through a flight of steps like those of a ladder ; the scriptural works should clearly point out these various steps or stages. Hence the characteristics which are dealt with in scriptural work naturally falls into two broad divisions, the general and the special.

This manner of treatment of a subject is called the approach of *tulārundati nyāya*, i.e., the treatment from the known to the unknown, from the gross to the subtle, from the external to the internal. The method employed in pointing out the subtle star called *arundati* is to show a big star near *arundati* and then, when the learner has fixed his gaze on the gross star, the real star is pointed out to him. The real object intended is not the gross one but the subtle one, which is near it. This kind of leading a person from the gross to the subtle is known as the approach of *tulārundati nyāya*, the example in which the gross is treated at first as the subtle *arundati* itself. *Arundati* is a small star in the constellation great bear called *saptarishi* group, situated near one of the seven constituent stars called *vasista*, and later on the real object is pointed out.

The following may be taken as illustrations where the above method is used. In Jñānamṛtam the disciple asks the master the reason for the Supreme Self being free from bondage and the individual self being chained by the spiritual darkness. The master at first answers that they are so from the beginningless past. If the spiritual darkness had come to the self at an intermediate point of time, it would have required a cause for such an occurrence. But we cannot give any reason for natural things. The Supreme Being is like the clear crystal whereas the individual self is like copper, which is made impure by its verdigris.

Here the example is given so that the disciple may understand the truth in a general manner. But the question is pursued further. Copper is made impure with the verdigris in accordance with the land

which produces it. So a better example is given in the following words : The same space is filled with both light and darkness ; if one of them dominates the other will subside. But still darkness cannot persist in the presence of light. Even though there is inner presence of Light, the individual self is submerged in spiritual darkness. So let us hoist the flag of grace, so that such an individual self may realize and be filled with the splendour of divine grace. In the former example, copper is such because it originates from the land of its birth, so it cannot be a suitable example for saying that no cause can be ascribed to the presence of the impurity. In the second case, the sky, light and darkness are independent of one another. So such a question will not arise. The second example is the first stanza of the work name ' *Kodikkavi* ', one of the fourteen Siddhanta manuals in Tamil.

Another example may be cited here. The question is whether the bondage of deed (*karma*) or the bondage of *māya* was the first to be attached to the individual self. The answer is given in two ways. Even as bran, husk and sprout of a rice seed are co-existent with the rice, so also the three principles of bondage are co-existent with the individual self. Another answer is even as the seed and the tree form a chain of cause and effect, so also *karma* and *māyā* form an endless chain of mutual dependence. In the first case since bran and husk are independent of each other, it is possible that they can co-exist in the rice. But *māyā* and *karma* are not independent of each other. Even though the seed and the tree are mutually the cause and the effect of each other, they have for their basic cause the five elements. So it is easy to conceive that either the tree or the seed might have been caused at first from the basic cause, and then the cycle of cause and effect started. So to cite them as examples and leave the answer so as to lead to infinite regress, is not proper. In this case the proper answer is given in the scriptures.

Conventions :

The scriptures that deal with gross truths or relative characteristics will be called gross or relative ones (*podu*) and those that deal with the true characteristics or the characteristics with respect to the state of freedom are called *true* (*ciṛappu* or *uṇmai*) ones. The true characteristics are the innate ones, whereas the adventitious ones are acquired ones as a result of the contact with alien objects. It may be noted that the term true is used with respect to the innate

characteristics in order to show that the characteristics given by other religions are false ones and they are not the true ones according to the standard scriptural authority.

Among the Āgamas, the *Pauṣkara*, the *Mrgēndra*, the *Matanga* and others deal with the characteristics of the eternal verities with respect to the state of bondage of the individual self. So they belong to the class of the gross (*podu*). The Sarvajñānōttara Āgama etc. deal with the characteristics with respect to the state of freedom. So they are the subtle ones. In the interpretation of the differing texts of the Āgamas, those that belong to the gross ones should be modified in accordance with the dictates of the subtle ones. This is the tradition followed by those whose wisdom is aided by the divine grace.

There is also another justification for dealing with Sarvajñānōttara texts independently, and the texts of *Pauṣkara* etc. as depending upon those of the Sarvajñānōttara. Sarvajñānōttara etc. are revealed to Lord Skandha, Lord Ganapati and others, whereas *Pauṣkara* etc. are revealed to the sages whose maturity of wisdom is at a lower level. Hence *Pauṣkara* etc. should depend on Sarvajñānōttara etc. The commentators *Aghora Śiva* and others failed to notice this viewpoint and so their commentaries are to be considered defective to that extent.

Even among the upaniṣads *supāla* and others deal with the three changes of the world, and are interested only in asserting the existence of an agent of those changes. So they should be considered as the gross (*podu*). Chāndōgya and the like describe things from the point of view of bondage and from the point of view of the state of release. So they are to be classified as being both gross and subtle (*podu and śirappu*). The upaniṣads *Atharvasikha*, *Atharvaśira*, *Śvetāśvatara*, *Kaivalya* and the like give the means and the end from the point of view of the state of release. So they are to be classed as subtle or true. As a direct consequence of this classification it follows that the dictates of *supāla* etc., are to be interpreted so as not to contradict the dictates of the true, the *Atharvasikha* etc. It is improper to construe the findings of the true in accordance with the findings of the gross. The commentator Rāmānuja and others have not followed this principle. So their interpretations are not to be accepted as valid.

Now even the upaniṣads when compared with the Śivāgamas are general like the expressions of the aphoristic literature. It is because of this principle, the Vēdas are said to be general and the Āgamas special. In Civaparakāsam Śaiva Siddhanta is referred to as the essence of the Vēdānta. The purpose of this mention is to drive home this distinction between the knowledge portion of the Vēdās and the knowledge portions of the Śivāgamas. With the same intention saint Sēkkizhar also, in the life story of Candīvara says that *saivam is the fruit of the Vēdas*. Those who cannot understand this truth because of the lack of grace of experienced teachers who come in the line of eternal preceptors, will say that the upaniṣads will contradict one with another, and the Śivāgamas also will contradict one with another. Tirukkalīṟruppadiyar, to impress this point of view, mentions that those who are learned in the scriptures do not enjoy the same clarity of view which is derived from the few words of a true master; it is only those that drink clear, crystal, distilled water that quench their thirst and not those that drink the water of the ocean that makes enormous noise.

Also even among the Tamil scriptures it should be noted that Jñānāmṛtam and others deal with the general characteristics and so they are to be considered as belonging to general class whereas *Tiruvundi* and *Tirukkalīṟruppadi* are to be considered special, as they deal with only the special characteristics of eternal verities.

The general characteristics are expressed in the form of the valid means of knowledge of the existence of particular verities and their definitions they are to be understood by means of listening to the scriptural knowledge imparted and by reflection. The special characteristics are expressed in the form of aspiration, spiritual means adopted (*sādana*) and the results (*payan*) enjoyed and are understood by the four means listening, reflection, determination and realization.

In the original stanza, the word ‘*nāḍi*’ (inquiring) implies by inference, and the word ‘*kanḍu*’ (having realized) implies by direct experience.

The intention of the introductory stanza is to say that the gross characteristics of the verities and their real characteristics are given in a mixed up manner in different scriptural works in different ways. So people who take to the study of these scriptural works understand

the intention of the scriptures differently and are divided among themselves into various classes as Aikyavāda śaivites etc. This work Śivajñāna Bōdham harmonises the truths by dividing those characteristics as general and special and synthesising them.

There are persons who hold that this work gives an epitome of the contents of all the āgamic works in twelve aphorisms. This view is inadmissible. There are other works, especially the aphorism which is at the commencement of Mrgēndra, which gives an epitome of the contents of the wisdom portions of the Āgamas. Further this introductory stanza speaks of inquiring into the nature of the selves, dispelling the darkness and having the direct experience which results in the removal of residual impressions of the bondage, which implies only the treatment of the contents of the wisdom portions of the Āgamas as aforesaid.⁵

The name of the work itself points to this nature of the work. The term 'Śivajñāna' is common to both the knowledge of the wisdom portion of the Śivāgamas and the light of grace of the Lord as per Śivaprakāśam stanza 10 of the introduction. *Bōdham* means teaching the determined conclusion of the exact import. So, this work determines the import of the wisdom portions of the Śivāgamas and hence this name for it. It is also clear that this can be derived from the last line of the twelfth sūtra of the Śivajñāna Bōdha in Sanskrit, which says 'know from Śivajñāna Bōdha the determined conclusion of the contents of the wisdom portions of the Śivāgamas in this way' (*ēvam vidyāt Śivajñāna bōdhē śaivārtha nirṇayam*).

Though the term 'Śivajñānam' denotes the Āgamic scripture as a whole, it is taken to indicate here the wisdom portions thereof ; for they are of prominence. The prominence of the wisdom portions will be clear from the dictum of Śivaprakāśam which says : whatever comes under the mention of *kriya* (purposeful action) is instrumental to the attainment of wisdom. One may be interested to know what works deal with the inquiry of the portions of carya, kriya and yōga pādas of the Āgamas. The work *kriya kānda kramāvali* whose

⁵ It is the latest view of the scholars that the Tamil original work of Meykaṇḍār is a Manual of the Śaiva Siddhanta system which supplies a flawless epistemological ground for the system. At best it can be considered as being conceived and shaped on the form of Brahama Sūtras, but with a view to be self-explanatory and terse, avoiding unnecessary details.

author is sōmasambhu Sivācārya may be cited as an example. It is also called Sōmasambhu paddhati.*

The commentator is of the firm opinion that Śivajñāna Bōdham forms part of the Śivāgamas which are considered to be the word of God. So he raises the question why these paddhatis were written by later preceptors instead of those ideas being expressed in the Śivāgamas themselves. He gives it as the answer that the purpose of these paddhatis is not to synthesise and harmonise the contents of the three pādas of the Āgamas. It is only the practice of the various injunctions in these parts of the Āgamas that are inquired into and determined by the later ācāryas. It is mentioned even in the Āgamas that there are slight differences in the injunctions made in the Āgamas in order to suit the aptitudes of those that follow them and the local and temporal requirements. So the festivals and other special requirements may be followed in the temples according to the Āgamas followed in the installation ceremony of the particular temple. Even among men, those that have received initiation ceremony according to a particular Āgama should follow that Āgama in the performance of other duties. So it is clear that the differences in the Āgamas with respect to the practices cannot be reconciled. But it is not so, for the wisdom portions. They deal with eternal verities whose characteristics will never change. So the reconciliation with respect to the contents of the wisdom portion of the Āgamas is beyond the ken and ability of ordinary human beings. Hence the inquiry and determination of the content of the wisdom portions are taken up by the supreme Being Himself, who has given it in the form of a chapter named Śivajñāna Bōdha in Rauvrāgama.*

In dealing with the characteristics of the eternal verities, the Āgamas deal with the general and special characteristics in order to suit the mental capacity of the learner to grasp them. Since the learner should not think that the Āgamas are inconsistent on that account, this work of inquiry distinguishes between the characteristics as general and special and shows the synthesis and harmony of the contents.

* Similar works are Varuṇa paddhati and Śivāgra paddhati.

* Meykaṇḍār is not considered to be an ordinary person but is held inspired by the divine and hence similar to God himself.

To cite an example of reconciliation by showing the consistency, it may be mentioned that Svāyambuvam etc., enumerate the entities as seven. Pauskara, Matanga etc., enumerate them as six. Parākhya etc., speak of five entities, Sarvajñānōttora etc., assert as four entities. Mrgēndra, Raurava and others speak of three entities. But all of them can be reduced to three entities, which is the determined view of all the Āgamas.

We shall here speak of the traditional view which states how Tirunandi Dēvar received Śivajñāna Bōdham. The Supreme Being willed about the creation of the universe at the end of the aeon. The scriptural works issued forth from the cosmic mind at first in the form of Nāda (mere awareness), secondly as Bindu (pointed knowledge), and thirdly in the form of language. The Lord assumed the form which is considered to be formless-form with the name Sadāsiva. It has five heads which are the personification of the five great mantrās Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa, Aghōra, Vāmadēva, and Sadyōjāta. Of these, Īśāna faces upwards turning its neck towards the north east. This is considered to be constituted of five heads in its turn. The other faces, Tatpuruṣa, Aghōra, Vāmadēva and Sadyōjāta face respectively the east, the south, the north and the west cardinal directions. This lord Sadāsiva composed the Vēdas and the Āgamas from the language. The Vēdas were breathed out through the lower four faces and were handed over to the creator, Brahma, through Anantēsvara. The twenty-eight Āgamas were expired through the five faces constituting Īśāna and were given individually each to the ten śivas commencing from Praṇava Śiva and the eighteen Rudras commencing from Mahā Rudra. This method of distributing the scriptural works is called pratisamhita method. After giving them to the 28 individuals separately the Lord gave all the 28 Āgamas to one person called Anantēsvara who is the leader among the eight Vidyēsvaras. Anantēsvara in his turn gave all the 28 Āgamas to Śrīkanṭha, who is the foremost among the one hundred and eighteen Rudras. The method of giving all the scriptures to a single person is called the maghauga method.

Śrīkanṭha in order that this scriptural knowledge may be spread among the śaiva legions, the devas and the saints, gave it at first to Tirunandi Dēvar. This is how the Āgamas were communicated to Tirunandi Dēvar.

After listening to the Āgamas communicated by Śrīkanṭha Tirunandi Dēvar felt apparent inconsistencies in the contents of the twenty-eight Āgamas and requested the master to reconcile them and grant him the synthesis of truth, Śrīkanṭha explained as follows :

The variations that are found in the first three divisions of the Āgamas namely carya pāda, kriya pada and yōga pada were to suit the requirements of the times and the aptitudes of the disciples. So the disciples are expected to follow the injunctions with respect to the three divisions in accordance with the Āgamas followed in the initiation ceremony. But the wisdom portions cannot be inconsistent as they deal with the characteristics of the eternal verities. They had been expounded to suit the psychological order in which the human mind is able to grasp the truth from the gross to the subtle. Really there is no inconsistency among the contents of the wisdom portions. In order that this truth might be explained, there is a chapter called Śivajñāna Bōdham consisting of twelve sūtras, in the Rauvravāgama. For a person who learns those sūtras the wisdom portion of the Āgamas will be clearly understood without any inconsistency. So saying Lord Śrīkanṭha expounded the contents of the sūtras to Tirunandi Dēva.

Tirunandi Devar after listening to the exposition of the sūtras found all his doubts cleared and understood the synthesis of truth. Then he imparted the knowledge of the work to Sanatkumāra the foremost among his disciples. Sanatkumāra imparted that knowledge to Satyajñāna Darśini who was the foremost among his disciples, from whom Paranjōti Munikal inherited the knowledge. This Paranjōti came to Meykaṇḍa Dēvar who was born in Tiruveṇṇai nallūr as a result of the wealth of penance performed by Tamil land. Saint Meykaṇḍa Dēvar was a perfected soul to whom Śivajñāna Bōdha was given with the traditional exposition which was the heritage of the divine preceptors. Saint Paranjōti asked Meykaṇḍa Dēva to give the content of the work in the form of twelve aphorisms in Tamil, with a commentary on them which expounded the interpretation of the aphorisms in the way in which they were inherited and imparted to him. Meykandar accordingly gave that work to Arulnandi Śivam, who was the foremost among all his disciples. This is how the Tamil land received the work through the line of preceptors.

The expression *uyar śivjñāna Bōdham* (Śivjñāna Bōdha that excels) in the introductory stanza means śivajñāna Bōdham which excels the works which make an inquiry into the contents of the three divisions carya pāda, kriya pāda and yōga pāda. Hence it would be clear that this work should be listened to after listening to the works dealing with the inquiry of other divisions. So it implies that the aspirant should first of all get initiated, study the Śivāgamas, then should listen to the works which inquire into the contents of the other three divisions and then make a study of Śivajñāna Bōdham. This work should be taught to a person who follows the injunctions contained in the other three sections of the Śaiva Āgamas and becomes aware of the contents, attains purity of mind, and is able to discriminate between the real and the unreal. He should dread the life on the earth and be eager to attain freedom. Here a doubt may arise. Those who in their previous birth have performed the means of worship of God as per the divisions carya pāda, kriya pāda and yōga pāda may not be required to follow those steps in this birth also, and the study of those divisions for a correct understanding of Śivajñāna Bōdham may not be necessary. But even those that follow the fourth division called Jñāna pāda are enjoined to perform the external and internal worship as per the three other divisions of the Āgamas, with a view to cleansing themselves of the residual impressions of the mala. Hence a detailed study and perfect knowledge of the other portions also are absolutely necessary for all persons who take to the study of Śivajñāna Bōdham.

From the introductory stanza we learn that Śivajñāna Bōdham is superior to those works that inquire into the three other divisions. It mentions the work as '*uyar Sivajñana Bōdham*'. This expression tells us the sequence that should be followed while taking to the study of Śivjñāna Bōdham (*yāppu*). It also tells us the competent person who should take to its study, the subject matter, and the name of the work. The end result of the study and the divisions of the work are also expressed in the stanza. The authority which the work follows and the author, including the jurisdiction in which the book is expected to be studied are also evident from the same stanza. These things have reference to the particular work on hand ; so the introductory stanza is called the *specific introduction*. (Cīrappu-p-pāyiram).

Validity of Saivāgamas

When we speak of the validity of the śaivāgamas the following objections may be raised : the Vēdas are valid because they are not created and are eternal. They are also accepted by the learned elite. So they are devoid of defects and are valid. But the Āgamas are not eternal, they have been created by some one. It is also a commonly accepted fact that the supreme Being can be understood only by means of the Vēdas. But among the valid works the smritis are also accepted, even though they are the works of men on earth, because they depend upon the Vēdas for their composition. But in the case of the Āgamas, it is not held that they are produced on the authority of the Vēdas. If they have been produced on the basis of the Vēdas, Śiva, (even like the authors of the smritis) the author of the Āgamas, will be subject to limited knowledge in as much as he depends for his enlightenment on the Vēdas and this will not be accepted by the Saivites who insist on their validity.

Also if it be said that the Āgamas are the works of God who has perfect knowledge, the question of mutual dependence occurs for the validity of the Āgamas depend on the authorship of the Omniscient God, whereas the existence of God is to be proved on the validity of the Āgamas. For these reasons one cannot be sure whether the Āgamas are valid scriptural authority.

Further in Vāsishtalinga it is said that those who follow the *tantras* are deeply ignorant. In Pādmapurāṇa there is a reference to *citrasēna* of *Drāviḍa dēsa* and it is said that he followed the advice of the *avaidikas*, renounced the way of life prescribed by the Vēdas and, following the way of *tantras*, and fell into the hell. In *sūtasamhita* it is said that those who follow the *tantra* literature such as *Pāncarātra*, *kāpāla*, *kālāmukha*, *śākta*, *Bauddha*, *Arhata*, *Pāsupata* and *Śambhava* and get initiated according to them, are inferior among the *brahmins* and their *tāntric* way of life is the effect of the curse uttered by Gautama on some sages when he came to know the hollowness of their ways and practices. In the *Kūrmapurāṇa* it is said that the *Tantras* are formulated in order to provide livelihood for those *brahmins* who have lost the competence to officiate as priests at sacrifices as a result of the curse by the six sages. In the same work it is said in the words of Lord Viṣṇu that Lord Śiva and Lord Viṣṇu created works which will

delude the minds of people (*mōha nūl*). From these it would be clear that the Āgamas are intent upon deluding the mind and that consequently they cannot be instrumental for attaining freedom from the bondage of life. Thus they cannot be held to be authoritative. This is how one might come to the conclusion on *prima facie* consideration.

The true conclusion is as follows : there is no authority for holding Vēdas as eternal. Their origin and dissolution are a matter of mere observation. So it is to be validly concluded that they are not everlasting. The recognition that the letter 'K' is the same as that K is a result of the similarity between the two different sounds as in the case of the flame of a lamp. Even if the alphabetic letters are taken to be everlasting, the words that are formed from the combination of such letters would be short lived. As the world has origin, development and dissolution, it is impossible to hold that the Vēdic expressions are eternal even like the flow of waters in a river. For these reasons it should be held that the Vēdas are the valid means of correct knowledge only because they have been created by Lord Śiva who is omniscient. In the same manner Śivāgamas too are valid in as much as they have been the creation of Lord Śiva. It will be understood by the declaration of the *sūtasamhitā* which says that all the paths from those of the Vēdas to that of materialism are valid, because they have been ordained by Lord Śiva.

As for the objection raised citing the inter-dependence of the existence of God and the validity of the Vēdāgamas, it may be said that a person who reminds us of his poverty cannot be said to commit the mistake of inter-dependence, for his words only remind us of his poor condition, and the act of charity depends upon the truth of his condition which is separately determined. The thing which causes a man to behave in a particular manner (*kāraka hētu*) is quite different from reminding him to behave in a particular manner (*jñāpakahētu*). These two causes are not inter-dependent.

Now we may also establish the non-inter-dependence of the validity of the Vēdas and the divine origin of them on the following lines of reasoning. We must at first establish that the Vēdas and the Āgamas are valid means of knowledge, because they have been held so by great men and then from what is given in them we can conclude that they are the products of the Supreme Being.

Now it may be questioned whether the Āgamas also are held to be valid by great men. The worship of Śiva is prescribed in the Vēdas. A person who wants to follow the prescription should necessarily follow the method prescribed in the Āgamas, for example, he who wants to attain paradise, must perform the sacrifice 'jyotiṣṭoma is a vedic dictum'. A man who wants to perform Jyōtiṣṭoma should necessarily follow the injunctions of the Vēdas and the kalpa sūtras which describe the method of performing jyōtiṣṭoma. Similarly a person who wants to follow the prescription of the Vēdas in the worship of Lord Śiva should necessarily follow the Śivāgamas which describe the manner of worshipping Lord Śiva. So it is very clear that all those that follow the prescriptions of the Vēdas must necessarily follow the Śivāgamas even as they follow the kalpa sūtras in the performance of the sacrifices. This argument is known from what Haradatta has said with regard to the validity of the Āgamas in his *śruti śūkti mālā*.

Even if this be granted, it may be argued, that we cannot be certain that the initiation ceremony which is called dīkṣa is agreed to by greatmen. But it is not so ; because *svēta*, *upamanyu*, *Agastya* and others are known to have had the initiation ceremony. It may also be noted from *Harivamśa*, *Bhāratam* and *Pādma purāṇa* that Lord Krishna and Lord Rāma received dīkṣa from *Upamanyu* and *Agastya* respectively. It should be inferred that dīkṣa was not granted to all the persons, as there were only very few that were competent to receive it. Dīkṣa should be performed only to persons whose maturity of *māla* was ensured.

This is similar to *Paramahamśa sannyāsa*, to receive which only very few people are competent or entitled.

If that be so, since Śāktāgamas also are produced by Lord Śiva, they should be held equally valid with the Śivāgamas like *Kāmika* etc. But it is not admissible, for certain customs that are permitted by the Śāktāgamas are prohibited specifically in the Vēdas. e.g. the installation of a pot filled with wine. These customs are prescribed to be followed by those who are not entitled to follow the Vēdic rituals. Hence there is no contradiction in the prescription of those habits in the śākta tantras and simultaneously prohibiting them in the Vēdas. This clarification is given in *Skānda Purāṇa*.

Now it should be followed as a principle that, wherever there are contradictions in the scriptures, those that are strong ones will prevail over the weaker ones. If it be said that this preferential treatment itself is a contradiction, we have to aver that it is not so. In fact the scriptures are not contradictory. But those that have expounded the implication of the scriptural statements are liable to contradiction because of the difference in their understanding and exposition. Those that have misunderstood the dictates of the original scriptures and have expounded or epitomised their findings according to their light are held to be weak. In all statements where there are no contradictions the validity is presupposed.

So far as the Vēdas and the Āgamas are concerned, it must be noted that Indra and others did not produce different works based on the Vēdas and Āgamas. Vyāsa and others for the Vedas, Praṇava and others for the Āgamas, expounded the tradition only. So to speak of the difference between the Vēdas and the Āgamas is not in conformity with the tradition held. But still there may be apparent contradictions in their expressions. If there be such contradictions in the propositions of the Vēdas, it should be understood that the difference has occurred owing to the difference of the subject matter. It is not to be held that they are contradictory, but the real intention behind the expressions are to be understood. There is another way in which the apparent contradictions in the exposition of the various religious creeds which have for their common source Supreme Being, will be resolved. Materialism was intended to be taught to those that did not believe in the existence of an intelligent self; their highest value in life is only the enjoyment of the materialistic world. In order to wean their minds away from the materialistic tendency the philosophical literature of materialism (Lōkāyata) is taught to them. They are told that the human body itself is the self and not the other living creatures. They are also taught that the worldly pleasure is not the highest value, for it is mixed up with painful experiences. Since they cannot understand subtler truths they are taught only that their embodiment is the self and the highest value in life is the death of the body.

When such people act accordingly, they become more prone to deserve God's grace and they begin to doubt if the body itself could be the self and the highest value in life could be the death of the body.

To such competent persons Buddhism is taught which asserts that the embodiment cannot be the self. In the same manner the higher religions are being taught to the human beings so as to supersede the lower ones, as in a ladder, whereby they are enabled to rise in height by ascending the steps in order. So the authorship of the various religions could belong to the same Supreme Being who is omniscient. From this it will be understood that the scriptures belonging to a lower rung will be refuted by those belonging to higher ones, whereas those scriptures are valid to the person whose spiritual development requires them. So there is no contradiction in holding a particular scriptural work as being valid and at the same time refuting it by a scriptural work which belongs to a higher cadre.

This should be held similar to the method of teaching adopted in Taittirīya and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads. Taittirīya at first points out the gross body as the supreme reality. Then it refutes that statement and asserts the subtle body to be the Supreme Reality. In this manner it points out the supreme Reality as the *manōmaya kōsa*, the *viññāna maya kōsa* and the *ānandamaya kōsa* in order, going from the grosser to the subtler ones. In the kauṣītaki, Indra teaches Daitya to suit his competence, that he himself is the Supreme Being. To lead the cows, grass is held in the hand so that they may follow the bunch of grass. In the same manner, scriptural works are produced in a serial order so as to lead men from the gross truth to the subtle one. This is said in Suta saṃhita.

It must be understood from the foregoing that the Vēdas and the Siddhanta Śivāgamas are the only valid scriptures and the books of other religions ranging from cārvaka to pāncarātra are valid in so far as they are not refuted by these two great scriptural works. It should also be understood that even among them secondaries are to be treated according to the strength of their validity the lower ones being refuted by the higher ones.

The reference that occurs in the purāṇas such as 'those who follow the tantras are ignorant', 'they have fallen into hell', 'they are the result of curses', 'they are intended for eking out livelihood' and 'they are books of delusion (Mōhanūl) etc., is to the religious works such as Pāsupāta and Pāncarātra śāstras which contradict the Vēdas and belong to the outer section. They do not at all refer to the Siddhanta Śivāgamas which are held to be the essence of the Vēdas

in as much as they expound only the Vēdic statements. This is also stated in the Vāyu samhita, Sanaṭkumāra samhita, Kūrma purāṇa, Magutāgama and others.

Even this condemnation of those that follow the scriptures of outer religions is not because that they adhere to the scriptures, but because they speak disparagingly on the Vēdas. Even this is mentioned in those places. The expression that the books on outer schools are made with the purpose of providing *vr̥tti* does not mean that they are produced with the purpose of giving them means of livelihood. The word '*vr̥tti*' means right conduct. So it means that they are intended for the good conduct of those that are left out from the Vēdic conduct as a result of curses. *Mōhanūl* means the books that confer supernatural powers with the use of medicinal stones, herbs and spell. The expression does not intend to convey that the works delude men.

Now even though the Vēdas and the Śivāgamas are one in content, they are considered as two, because one group belongs to the higher three castes and the other group is common to all the four castes. In this manner Saint Umāpati has established the validity of the Śivāgamas in his commentary on Pauṣkara jñānapāda.

The following statements occur in the commentary of Sri-Nīlakanṭha on Brahma sūtra in the section describing the qualities of pati. Among the Śivāgamas one set states that the Supreme Being is the efficient cause only. In order to refute that idea this section has arisen : so some will say. But it is not correct. We do not see any difference between the Vēdas and the Śivāgamas. As Lord Śiva is the author of both the scriptures—Vēdas and Śivāgamas, even the Vēdas are known as Śivāgamas. So Śivāgamas are of two kinds : One belonging to the three castes and the other belonging to all the four castes. Of these the former is known as the Vēdas and the latter is known as Śivāgamas. The author of both these classes is Śiva alone. This is said in the Vēdas, Purāṇas and Śivāgamas. The mantras such as Panca brahma, Praṇava, the letters five, Prāsāda etc., the terms of eternal verities such as Pati, Paśu, Pāśa etc., and the virtuous acts such as smearing the body with the sacred ash or wearing the holy ash in the form of three lines, wearing rudrākṣa and performing Śiva pūja are found both in the Vēdas and Āgamas in the same manner. So both of them are equally valid as the author is the

same, the contents are one and the same, and there is no contradiction between the two. For all these reasons we are to say that this section has arisen to refute the yoga Śāstras which belong to the religion of the Hiranyagarbha which states that God is only the efficient cause. This is what is said in the commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha Śivācārya on Brahma sūtras.

These ideas are further elaborated by Appaiya Dīkṣit and the validity of the Śivāgamas are established by him in Śivādittamani Dīpika and Śiva tattva vivēka.

It is said in the commentary on Brahma sūtra by Nīlakaṇṭha that the division of the scriptures into two kinds, the Vēdas and the Śivāgamas, is because one belongs to the three castes and the other belongs to all the four castes. But we hold, for the reasons to be stated below, that the division is because of the gross form of expression in one and elaborate and detailed form of expression in the other, according to the principle known as from the gross to the subtle (tūlarundadi nyāya).

In Śivajñāna Siddhiyār it is said that the Vēdas and the Śivāgamas are the only books to be characterised as fundamental scriptures. All other works have been derived from these. These are the original ones and are given by the Lord who is inherently free from bondage. The Vēdas are general and the unique Śivāgamas are special. These are intended to be studied respectively by the secular minded and the spiritual minded. The Śivāgamas speak of rituals which are not mentioned in the Vēdas, as a complement to those mentioned and also give an exposition of the concluding portions of the Vēdas. So the Śivāgamas are the end or the final conclusion of the Vēdas whereas the others namely the six darsanas and others are prima facie ones.

Periyapurāṇam while giving the interpretation of the hymn called Tiruppāsuram by way of introduction says that the Vēdic performance is secular whereas the everlasting true philosophy is the path shown by the Śivāgamas. These are the reasons for the above final opinion expressed by us.

Some among the Saivites say that the Vēdas cannot be held as valid for two reasons. The first is that all the scriptures are classified into five categories, the secular ones, Vedic ones, spiritual ones, the

super path and the mantras, of which the first four are considered as outer ones. The second reason is that the Vēdānta is refuted as one belonging to outer religion from expressions such as, 'In the Vēdānta, the self is the only reality'. This view should be refuted as being indiscriminate. Sarvātma Śambhu in his Siddhānta Prakāśika says that Vēdic ones referred to in the above classification denotes Mīmāṃsa, Vaiśeṣika and Naiyāyika, and the Vēdānta which is classified as one among the outer schools is the work of Vyasa which sponsors the theory of the unity of the self, averting that the self is one. From this it will be clear that the Vēdic works and the Vēdānta referred to in the Āgamas and refuted are different from what is really held to be the vēdas and the Vēdānta respectively. Even the term Vēda occurring in that context denotes only the Mīmāṃsa which inquires into the contents of the earlier portions of the Vēdas. Since the Mīmāṃsa inquires into the contents of the Vēdas, it came to be known as the Vēda. If we fail to discriminate in this manner, our conclusion will be in disagreement with the conclusion of the Śivāgamas which establish the validity of the Śivāgamas on the basis of the identity of their contents with the contents of the Vēdas. Such expressions are : 'It is only the vaidik that is competent to follow the injunctions of the Śivāgamas, since they are the essence of the Vēdas', 'The wisdom portion of the Āgamas which are called Siddhānta is the clear exposition of the contents of the Vēdānta. All other works do mention other things.'

The two meanings in which some of the terms are used should be discriminated and understood. The word 'Pāśupatam' when related to its constituent parts will indicate, Śivāgamas. The word as a whole will denote the particular Āgamas which are called Pāśupata Āgamas. So also the word 'Vēdānta' when looked at as a word derived from the meaning, 'the concluding portion of the Vēdas' will indicate upaniṣads. But without relating it to its derivation it will indicate the Vyāsa sūtras that make an inquiry into the expressions that occur in the upaniṣads, the Vēdānta.

Siva dīkṣa (The initiation ceremony)

To become competent to recite the Vēdas and follow the dictates of the Vēda it is clear that one should have the initiation ceremony called *upanayana* (the sacred thread ceremony). In the same manner

Śiva dīkṣa is a desideratum for a person who intends to take to the study of the Śivāgamas and to conduct himself according to their dictates.

Dīkṣa primarily is divided into two kinds, the nirādāra and the sādāra (not requiring a substrate or locus and requiring a substrate or locus). Of these the initiation which is given to the two kinds of the individual selves named Vijñānakalās and pralayākalās without having resort to any locus is called nirādāra. It is done in two ways according to the falling of grace, the vigorous and the more vigorous (tīvra, tīvratara).

For the Vijñānakalās this is done by the Supreme as being the self of the self (i.e. from within). For the pralayākalās the Lord presents Himself before the disciple in the form of Sadāśiva and initiates him in the path of wisdom. Of the two kinds of falling of grace, the vigorous one confers on the initiate the offices of Ananta dēva and others, the more vigorous one confers on the aspirant the freedom from birth itself.

The initiation classified as sādāra (i.e. with the locus) is that done to the sakalās by assuming the embodiment of a spiritual master, through four kinds of the fall of grace namely tardier, tardy, vigorous, and more vigorous (manda tara, manda, tīvra and tīvratara).

It is of many kinds, from the casting of the gracious look on the disciple etc. Of these the initiation which is done with fire worship (hautri) is important. This hautri is of two kinds, *adhikārai* and *niradhikārai*; also called *sabīja* and *nirbīja* respectively. Of these Sabīja is for those who have the capacity not to deviate from Saivācāra. It cleanses the accumulated actions of the disciple, leaving out the prescribed duties in connection with religion (samayācāra karma). This forms part of asadyō nirvāna and is of two kinds sivadharminī and lōka dharminī. Nirbīja is that which is done to those who cannot strictly follow the religious injunction and it cleanses even the religious injunction along with other deeds with the fire worship. This is of two kinds, asadyō nirvāna without bijam and sadyō nirvāna. Those that get initiated with sabīja dīkṣa are of two kinds the trainee (the aspirant or Sādhaka) and the master. They are competent to perform daily rites, special rite and the rites which fulfil the desires. The initiation which bestows this competence on the

recipient is sabija nirvāna. This sabija nirvāna and the samaya, viśesa initiations which form the limbs of this are called sādḥikārai (bestowing competence). Those who receive nirbija nirvāna and its limbs samaya and viśesa are not competent to perform the special rituals and the rituals fulfilling desires. So they are called niradhikarais (not conferring competence). Both of these are of two kinds each, kriyāvati and jñānavati, i.e., initiation given with external paraphernalia and that which is done by mental acts alone.

These two ways may be compared to the external worship and the internal worship of God respectively. In this way Sōmasambhu and others first of all classify the initiation ceremony into two kinds namely conferring competence (sādḥikārai) and not conferring competence (Niradhikārai) and then expound the various kinds of initiation such as samaya (entry into the religion) etc. So it is clear that all the latter injunctions are pertinent to both the kinds, kriyāvati and jñānavati (with outward rituals and inward rituals respectively).

In the inward ritual, the navel is considered to be the fire pit. The central point between the eye-brows is the place of ambrosia. The heat in the stomach is the fire and the respiratory nerves called ida and suṣumna are the ladle and its cover through which the sacrificial ghee is offered to the fire. These are always pure. So the rituals of purification need not be done with respect to the inward kind. All other ceremonies are common to both the inward and the outward kinds.

The gesture of perception (nirīksana) which is required for the purification of the embodiment of the disciple etc., should be performed as in kriyāvati. In the outward ceremony the external fire is used. In order to purify this fire it is conjoined with the natural fires at the navel and at the midpoint of the eye-brow, and is imagined to have been born of the Intelligent energy of Śiva and is given the name Śivāgni. So the inward ceremony where the internal fires which are pure by nature is preferable to the outward ceremony where the external fire is purified and then made use of. There is the injunction that the internal fire should be raised by inspiration of breath control to the place which is called dvādasānta (the place which is twelve inches higher than the top of the head). This is to make the internal fire assume the nature of pure wisdom. This should not be considered to be a purificatory process.

In the Sivajñāna Śiddhiyar also it is said at the commencement that the initiation with fire worship is of two kinds that involving wisdom and that involving action. At the conclusion the alternative is given to perform the ritual either inwardly or externally, involving wisdom or involving action. So it is clear that all things said in between these two stages are applicable to both the kinds. The expression, 'with the mind performing action' should be rearranged and read as 'performing action with the mind'. Other things mentioned in this paragraph should be read along with the stanza of Śivajñāna Siddhi* which is given separately.

Those that do not understand this implication give the meaning in their own way. But those expositions should be considered as atheistic, since they are given in ignorance of what is said in Somasambhu paddhati. The wisdom initiation is of two kinds. One is called the initiation with śakti where the actions are performed with the mind and the instruments are purified. After purifying the instruments an initiation which is called vijñāna dīkṣa is performed in order to remove the shortcomings in the mantras, gestures, and meditation. This is called sām̐bava dīkṣa. So it is to be understood that initiation by intelligence is of two kinds as said above.

It may be argued that the installation ceremony should be performed only with outward rituals as there are no dicta which ordain that too can be performed either inwardly or outwardly. This holds good in the case of installation in temples where it is performed in order to do good to the society. But the installation which is done to do good to individual selves (ānmārtham) is a part of the initiation ceremony. So in the case of the individual self, installation may be done either with inward ritual or with outward ritual. This can be easily understood.

Inward final sacrifice for the departed

Now let us take up the final rituals for those who have received initiation by inward rituals. For the renounced, burial alone is ordained. For those who led the life of the bachelor after receiving initiation by inward ritual and acting according to the scriptures, their body is to be cremated after their death as usual and funeral

* Śivajñāna Siddhi : 'manattāl kiriyai iyaruvatu'.

ceremonies may be performed. At the end of the funeral period the individual selves of the person concerned may be treated like kitten and placed in some such thing as sandle paste and all the funeral rites may be repeated inwardly following the order of dissolution. Those that have received the first initiation (*samaya dīkṣa*) may be sent to the world of Rudra. Those that have received the second initiation (*viśēṣa dīkṣa*) which is a special one should be sent to the world of Iswara. Those that have received the wisdom initiation (*nirvāṇa dīkṣa*) should be considered to have reached the feet of the Supreme Being.

Samaya dīkṣa : In the first initiation, the hall of divinity is prepared and the devotee is made to worship the lord and is purified with the sacrificial ghee. By this initiation the person becomes competent to adhere to the conduct of Saiva religion.

Special initiation (*Viśēṣa dīkṣa*) : This is done to a person who has been initiated with the first ceremony. In the sacrificial pit the Supreme consorts (*Vāgīśvara* and *Vāgīśvari*) are established and the self of the disciple is sent through *Vāgīśvara* to the womb of *Vāgīśvari* and all the ceremonies regarding the confinement are done. This is done by pouring the sacrificial ghee thrice for each ceremony. The self is considered to have evolved and had rebirth from *Vāgīśvari*. Then the self is taken from the sacrificial pit and is established in the heart of the disciple. Thus the disciple is transformed into the son of Lord Śiva. By this initiation the disciple becomes competent to perform Śiva worship in the insignia of śiva and to do meditation and to study the Saivaite scriptures.

Wisdom initiation (*Nirvāṇa dīkṣa*) : To get the wisdom initiation one should have got the first two initiations. In Saiva scriptures the whole universe is divided into six *adhvās* (ways). They are the letters, the mystic spells (*padas*), the mantras, *kalās*, *tattvas* and the worlds. These six *adhvas* are the means through which the selves accrue actions and enjoy their fruits. So the master should know how the individual selves perform actions, by thought, word and deed. He should also know how these six *adhvas* are involved in the five *kalās* and he should examine the deeds performed in these five *kalās* and should be able to free the self from the bondage of the actions which are bound by these five *kalās* one after another. Such freed self should be taken into the supreme Being by means of *Prāsāda*

yōga. When the self becomes one with the supreme Being it loses its individuality and assumes the six characteristics of the supreme. By offering the sacrificial ghee thrice for each characteristic, they should be made manifest so that the self may enjoy supreme bliss. This is just like the crystal which assumes the nature of the gem with which it comes in contact. This is done by imparting the general nature of the three eternal verities and thereby removing the evil principle and manifesting the real wisdom. This is wisdom initiation.

A person who has received this initiation is competent to enquire into the true implication of the Saiva scriptures. With that enquiry the self receives the enlightenment caused by the divine grace, knows the real nature of the supreme Being and becomes free from the bondage of the world, and attains oneness with the supreme Being. This is given in the scriptures of Sivajnana Siddhiyar and Sivapra-kāsam.

There are some persons who do not understand the implication of the scriptural language and wrongly think that initiation itself will lead to liberation and that even the term divine wisdom means only initiation by the use of the figure, metonymy. This should be refuted, as initiation alone cannot bestow supreme bliss on the self. In *pauskara* the seers request the lord to impart them the wisdom arising out of the wisdom portions of the Āgama and say that it is only through the wisdom that one has the competence to become the master and it is only through wisdom that spiritual darkness is dispelled resulting in the manifestation of the qualities of the Supreme. These expressions cannot be taken otherwise. The term 'dīkṣa' means destroying the spiritual impurity and bestowing wisdom. In fact dīkṣa or initiation is only the potency of the action of the lord which confers, the competence of following the injunctions of the Āgamas after listening to them. This is the common characteristic of all the initiations. A man who is blind from the time of birth is not able to see and understand things by mere removal of the cataract. He should be taught the names and other characteristics of the various things he is led to see. The Āgamas like Sivadharmōttara, Sarvajñānōttara, Jñāna tilaka etc., definitely say that beatitude is to be obtained only by means of divine wisdom.

Now it should be understood that even the spiritual darkness cannot be removed by mere initiation unless there is realization on

the part of the aspirant. This may be likened unto the dispelling of darkness only with the introduction of light. In the initiation ceremony it is only the effects of the actions adhering to the various adhvas that are removed and one becomes eligible to receive divine wisdom.

It is held by some people that the spiritual darkness can be removed only by dīkṣa performed with sacrificial fire even as the cataract of the eye should be removed only by the eye doctor with the use of his instruments. This is not admissible. Vijñānakalās attain liberation and reunion, with the mere thought force of the Supreme Being which happens from within. So the proposition that spiritual darkness can be removed only with the hautri dīkṣa is not universal. So the action of the thought force of the supreme alone is the cause for the removal of the spiritual darkness. Also the potency of action and that of wisdom are not different and dīkṣa is only a name for the potency of action and its manifested form hautri, is only the subsidiary cause in removing the spiritual darkness which is done only by the potency of wisdom. Hautri removes the accumulated effects of past deeds and thereby enables the removal of the spiritual darkness. Hence it should be noted that hautri is only an accessory and not the main cause in the removal of the internal darkness. It may be said that dīkṣa is another name for thought force and so it alone should be taken to be the cause for the removal of the spiritual darkness. But this is not a new thing arrived at by us because of the question raised by the opponent. It is the real position which is held by us. Hence for the opponents it involves the defect which is called siddha sādhana in our dialectics. In Sivaprakasam it is said that inimitable nirvāṇa will enable the self to reach the highest beatitude. Here it should be understood that the initiation through the conferment of wisdom of grace enables the self to attain the highest value.

Now it should be understood that the wisdom initiation which goes by the name nirvāṇa dīkṣa is of two kinds, namely sadyōnirvāṇa and asadyō nirvāṇa. The first of these two kinds, as soon as it is performed, enables the person to realize the true nature of the supreme and removes the works that have been brought with the present embodiment as well as that done by the embodiment itself and confers the highest value of life at once. Asadyō nirvāṇa confers the highest value of life at the end of the present life in which the receiving soul eats up the prārabdha brought with the embodiment. The self may attain higher worlds and thereafter may enjoy the highest value of

life. The first kind is done to the selves that have tīvratara saktinipāda and the second kind is performed to those that have the other three kinds of saktinipāda, namely mandatara, manda and tīvra.

This asadyōnirvāṇa is of two kinds, ulaka dharmini and Siva dharmini. In the ulakadharmini (secular) it is only the virtuous actions that are purified and it is also called bhaudika dīkṣa. In Siva dharmini both the virtue and the vice are purified. It has the alternative name naiṣṭika dīkṣa. Of these bhaudika dīkṣa or ulaka dharmini is done to the bachelor, the house holder, and the recluse. The other dīkṣa which is Sivadharmini or naiṣṭika, is done to bachelors who vow to remain bachelors through out life and to the ascetics.

The distinction between bhaudika bachelor and the naiṣṭika bachelor is that the former observes the rules of bachelorship upto a certain stage and then gets married and becomes a house holder, whereas the latter vows to be a bachelor throughout the life. But since the latter continues to have sacrificial ceremony, he is entitled to get married with the permission of his teacher in the prescribed manner if he feels inclined to discontinue the bachelorship. But in the case of an ascetic who has given out the ceremonial fire worship also, this cannot be allowed, i.e., he cannot revert to the householder-ship.

The bachelors and the ascetics are called naiṣṭikas as they are initiated by the naiṣṭika dīkṣa and those that have received bhaudika dīkṣa are called bhaudikas. Thus people belonging to the four stages of life are classified into two according to the nature of initiation that they receive. Those that do not understand the implication of the classification into two according to the nature of initiation received, will say that there are only two stages of life in Saiva religious practice, which is incorrect. The Saivāgamas prescribe purification and tactile rituals in four different ways so as to suit the four different stages of life. The Āgamas, Cintya, Viśvasādhākhyā and others deal with Saiva asceticism and mention the classification of it as tapasvī, vividuśu and vidvān and prescribe the daily practice for each of them and also the way in which the mortal remains of these persons should be laid in the grave in different manners. Also it has been shown above that the Vēdas and Sivāgamas are one in essence. So the Sivāgamas cannot prescribe injunctions contradictory to the Vēdic prescriptions. For these reasons the above statements should be ascribed to those

that hold conclusions contrary to the traditions of the Vēdas and the Sivāgamas.

The competence for the mastership : It is said that the ascetics are not competent to give initiation to others inas much as the consecration ceremony is prohibited to them. This is also the expression of those that are not willing to conform to the traditions of the Vēdas and Sivāgamas, for the prohibition is restricted to the ascetics that come under the category of tapasvi, and all those things that are said about the naiṣṭikas will apply equally to the bachelors and the ascetics that come under the group naiṣṭikas.

The Acintya and Viśvasādākhyā expressly say that the ascetic who comes under the category of vidvan is entitled to consecration ceremony without the fire worship. But if it be interpreted so as to limit the competence to the sāmabhava dīkṣa alone, that interpretation is not a correct one as it is not expressed so.

Even if it be so it may be asserted that in Saiva religious practice, initiation ceremony is the prominent one and that the distinctions made with respect to the caste and the four stages of life are not proper. Even this is the assertion of those that are not willing to conform to the traditions of the Vēdas and Āgamas for the following reasons :—

The very first reason is that the practices that are observed after the initiation ceremony are given merit according to the caste distinctions and the stages of life led by the practitioner. Another reason is that by dīkṣa or initiation it is only the spiritual dirt that is removed and not the imperfections of the body as in the case of Vēdic ceremonies. This is said in Siddhānta sārāvalī and other works. If it be said that the distinction of caste is also removed by the initiation then the terms that distinguish between Ādi śaiva, Mahā śaiva, Anu śaiva, Avāntara śaiva etc., become meaningless and the practices that are prescribed for a Mahā Śaiva cannot be practised by an Avāntara śaiva. Further it is expressly said that a brahmin can be the teacher to all those that belong to the four communities, the kṣatriya can be the teacher for three communities, starting from kṣatriya, a vaiśya can be the teacher of two communities starting from vaiśya and a sūdra can be a teacher to a sūdra alone. Also it is expressly said in Kāmika which is the foremost of all the Āgamas that all the persons that belong to the four stages of life are entitled to be teachers

in the first three castes, whereas it is only the naiṣṭikas in the fourth community that could be teachers and they can recite the mantras including praṇava and perform ceremonies like installation etc. The householder among the fourth community is entitled to the daily practices and he is not competent to perform practices that come under naimittika. Even among the daily practices he is entitled to pronounce mantras without the praṇava. This householder is not entitled to consecration. So it need not be mentioned that he is not competent to perform installation etc. From these it is clear that there is distinction belonging to the four stages of life and in as much as Ulaka dharmini is enjoined for a bhaudika and sivadharmini for a naiṣṭika there is also a distinction in the matter of initiation. There is no original text for saying that sivadharmini is admitted for the householder also. All the Āgamas prohibit sivadharmini for a householder ; it is prescribed that a naiṣṭika should initiate a naiṣṭika as well as a bhaudhika, and a bhaudika should initiate only a bhaudika. From these prescriptions the distinction of high and low is ascribed to persons according to the community by birth and the stages of life led by the person.

It should be clearly understood that the prominence expressed in the Śivāgamas of the householder is with respect to the ādiśaivas alone, who are elevated with respect to the temple worship which is done for the good of the society. Even the dictum that the bachelor and the householder only are the teachers and not the other two, the recluse and the ascetic is with respect to the ādi śaivas alone in respect of the temple worship. It may also be interpreted that so far as the outer rituals (Kriyāvati) are concerned, these two alone are the teachers and not the others. If we do not construe in this way, these dicta are not in harmony with the expressions in the other śivāgamas. If it be so it may be argued then : In all the four communities the ascetics and the householders are the teachers so say the Āgamas. Hence it is not proper to give importance to the dictum of the Kāmika Āgama and assert that the householder among the sūdras are not entitled to be teachers. If it be said so, we are inclined to say that it is not the correct interpretation, for the dictum that in all the four communities the renounced and the householder alone can be teacher is a general statement which is applicable to all. But the rule which is given by the Kāmikāgama that the householders among the sūdras cannot be teachers is a special one which is not ambiguous.

It is the well known principle that even if thousand general rules collectively say a particular thing, the special one which is expressed explicitly will restrict those general ones so as not to contradict its content, but will apply only to the rest that are not covered by the special one. This is accepted by all schools of thought. So the dictum of the Kāmikāgama will prevail as it is the stronger one.

It may be proposed that the special rule of the kāmikāgama apply only to ordinary people among the householders of the fourth caste. But that interpretation is not admissible, for, that ordinary people among all the four castes are prohibited from becoming teachers is obtained from the characteristics of a teacher that are mentioned in the Āgamas. So it need not be unnecessarily expressed again. Also if we admit that interpretation it will give room for the idea that the naiṣtika and the householder among the higher three castes are entitled to become teachers even if they are ordinary leads to absurdity and makes all the rules that are given with respect to the competence of a teacher useless.

Again it may also be argued thus. Assuming that even householders are eligible for naiṣtika dikṣa the householders possessing the naiṣtika dikṣa are eligible to be teachers and the prohibition that the householder cannot get consecration etc. may be taken to be referring to the bhaudikas alone. This is not admissible, for the supposition that naiṣtika dikṣa may be performed even to the householder is the opinion of those that do not conform to the traditions of Sivāgamas. From this it may be understood that the teachers among the sūdras in olden days were only naiṣtikas. Among those naiṣtikas some could not pursue the life of a bachelor and they got married and they continued to be teachers in order to earn their livelihood. They not only did that, they placed the competence of being teachers even to their successors. This thing can be well understood if their family history is inquired into. The Śivāgamas have prescribed teachership as a hereditary right only with respect to Ādi Śaivas and they do not prescribe the right of being a teacher as a hereditary one to non-adi Saivas.

Again it should be understood that the initiations through hautri are restricted to the first three communities brāhmaṇa, ksatriya, vaiśya, sat sūdras (the fourth community observing vegetarianism) and the anulōmas (those that are born of a high caste male and low

cast female). Know that the others are eligible for initiation with the mere look of the master, his touch etc. They are not eligible for initiation with sacrificial fire. Initiation by look etc., are of two kinds, (1) those that are performed independently and (2) those that are performed as forming part of the *hautri* which go by the name *samaya* and *visēṣa*. For more elaborate information, the student is advised to refer to the *Sivāgamas*.

The distinction between *sat sūdras* and *asat sūdras* (vegetarians and non-vegetarians) is mentioned in the *Sivāgamas*, in *smrtis* like that composed by *Parāsara*, in the *purāṇas* and in the commentary on the *sūtra* beginning with the word *sudraṇam* of *Pāṇini*. Those that do not know this distinction will classify even *sat sūdras* along with *asatsūdras* and demean them. Their action is similar to that of those that do not distinguish between ordinary men and men who are entitled to study and follow the *vēdas*.

We need not be surprised if these people do not care to consider the distinction between Vegetarians and non-vegetarians among the fourth community, for, there are people who cannot distinguish the *Mahā Rudra* who is the *Paramaśiva* and the ordinary *Rudrās*. Similarly they cannot distinguish between *Śivāgamas* and the *Āgamas* which deal with unvēdic traditions.

All the vēdic scriptures distinguish expressly between the *Rudra* whose function it is to destroy the world and who resides along with *Viṣṇu* and *Brahma* in the evolute called *guṇa* and *Sadāśiva* who resides in the evolute called *sādākhyā*. The distinction between *Pāsupata*, *Pāncaratra* and others and the *Śivāgamas* starting from *kāmika* is also mentioned in the *purāṇas* like *Vāyusamhitā*. This brings us to the end of the commentary on the special introductory stanza.

*The commentary on Sivajñāna Bōdham
Invocatory Verse*

The author *Meykanda Dēva* commences his work of translating¹ *Sivajñāna Bōdha* which occurs in the *Raurava āgama* in order to delineate the true intention of the wisdom portions of the *Śivāgamas*,

¹ Modern scholars consider *Śivajñāna Bōdham* as an original work in Tamil, and the slokas in sanskrit which are attributed to be a part of *Rauvrava Āgama* as translation of the Tamil work.

Kāmika etc. He does this in order to enable the Tamil Society to know the purport of the work. The intention of Śivajñāna Bōdha is to remove the apparent contradictions among the wisdom portions of the Śivāgamas and to point out the real intention behind them. He is a released soul who even in his wakeful state is in touch with the Beyond, and he knows that no obstacles can prevent him from completing any of his undertakings. But still he praises the characteristics of Lord Gaṇēṣa who is the deity in control of the obstacles, in the form of a stanza, just to follow the traditions of the elite and inculcate the desirable tradition in his disciples.

Invocation

The good will crown their heads with the flowery feet of Pollār in order that the master seated in the shade of the bānyan tree may shower His choicest blessings.

This is the purport of the stanza, ‘ Kallal Nizhal malai Villar
Aruliya Pollar inai malar nallar punaivare ’

Commentary : Generally the invocation will be one of the three forms, those expressing wish, or prayer, or the nature of the Supreme. This stanza expresses the nature of the Supreme.

The expression 'the shade of the bānyan tree' refers to the locality from which the lord instructed his disciple Nandi Dēvar with the work on hand.

The expression ‘malaivillār’ (one who removes the confusion) indicates that the Lord removed, with the content of the book on hand, the confusion with which the disciple approached the feet of Lord and said that the Āgamas seemed to express contradictory ideas. The verb ‘illār’ is to be taken in the causative sense, meaning removed or dispelled. The Tamil word ‘*malaivu*’ means doubt or confusion.

It is also possible that the same expression may mean the Lord who used the mountain Mēru as his bow while destroying the three wandering cities of the demons*. The implication in that case will be

* The compound 'Malaivillar' should be separated into its parts as 'malaivu-illar' in the first case, and 'malai' (mountain meru) 'villar' in the second case.

that the Lord had bestowed the worldly enjoyment to people by reducing to ashes the cities of the enemies with the bow of the mountain, and granted the highest value in life, spiritual liberation, by being seated under the shade of a bānyan tree. The substance is that the Lord is the agent of the five cosmic functions.²

The term 'aruḷiya' means in order to bestow grace on. This is to be taken to be the purpose with which the predicate verb 'punaivar', crown their heads is used. So it modifies the predicate verb 'punaivar'. It means in that case, 'in order that He may shower His Grace'. The expression 'Aruḷiya' may also be taken to be adjectival, qualifying *Pollār*, i.e., *Pollār* who was begotten by the Lord seated under the shade of the banyan tree. The word 'Pollār' is another form of 'Pollar', which means one who was not shaped with the use of the chistle. In other words the form of *Ganēśa* is not man-made but is original obtained in nature. Such images are called svayambhu mūrtis.³

The expression 'iṇaimalar' means the two feet of the Lord *Ganēśa* which are like lotus flowers. The expression 'punaivar' means beautify; in order to suit that expression the two feet of the Lord *Ganēśa* have been referred to figuratively as two flowers.

The good (nallār) means those that have listened to scriptures, contemplated on their meaning, and understood the real meaning. Crowning the head (punaital) means to be in tune with the infinite, as the compound word, tādalai⁴ is.

The tamil stanza belongs to the category of *Vanjiturai* which has four lines, each consisting of two metres. The stanza consists of twelve words, beginning from *kal* and ending with 'ē'. This indicates that the work is composed of twelve aphorisms. The four lines each consisting of three words indicate that the work has four chapters each composed of three aphorisms. The first six words have one

² The Five functions are: creation, sustenance, dissolution, obscuration and deliverance

³ Svayambhu—Appearing by oneself. Mūrthi—Form with shape

⁴ Tādālai—This is a compound of two words in Tamil tāl and talai. When they are combined together and pronounced they appear to be a single word. Similarly the infinite self and the individual self are two different entities. In the state of release the individual self subordinates itself to the infinite Self and merges in it. So in the state of release unity alone is perceived.

verbal ending and the remaining part ends with the predicate verb, which shows that the work consists of two broad divisions, the general and the special, each consisting of six aphorisms.

The first three words indicate the place where the Lord is seated ; this indicates implicitly that the first chapter deals with the means of knowledge and the chapter is called pramāṇa iyal. The next three words deal with the action of the Lord, which points to the fact that the second chapter deals with the characteristics of the entities that have been established in the first chapter.

The third group of three words makes mention of the feet of the Lord, which indicates that the chapter deals with the means or the sādana that one has to adopt to get release.

The last three words make mention of the fact that great men crown their heads with the lotus feet of pollār. This indicates that the last chapter deals with the end or the goal pursued, which in Tamil is called payan iyal. In this way the invocatory stanza points to the characteristics of the composition on hand.

The commentary also makes mention of one very important subtle thing. The fourth word ' malaivu ' is placed partly in the first line and partly in the second, which indicates that the fourth aphorism is connected in meaning to the third aphorism and accordingly the author Meykandar of the twelve sutras gives the purport of the fourth aphorism in the words, ' this is the same as the foregoing one ' (Ituvum atu). The commentator points out that the invocatory verse should indicate in a general way the purport and the nature of the composition of the whole work. He further quotes a stanza from siddhiyar which is a secondary to Sivajñāna Bōdham so as to substantiate the truthfulness of the composition into the four respective chapters.

Respect to the audience (Apologetic verse)

By the invocatory verse⁵ the author has indicated the nature of the Godhead in this religious philosophy, and by this stanza indicating

⁵ From the invocatory verse it can be gleaned that the Supreme being is omniscient by himself and the individual selves have to be aided in the function of their knowing. It can also be inferred that the Supreme being assumes the forms and names with which the devotee conceives of Him according to his light and enables him to grow in nature and stature dispelling the inner darkness which is the cause of the bondage.

respect to the audience he expressed the greatness of Saiva Siddhanta and the defective nature of the other schools of philosophy. The stanza runs thus :

Those that have realized the Supreme Being, the Lord, after realizing the true nature of themselves are the Supreme Being itself, and they have us as their bondmen. So they will not ignore us or the work produced by us : but those who do not realize their own nature cannot realize the Supreme Being. So they will not co-operate among themselves and see the integrated whole. If they criticize us behind us or in front of us we shall not attach significance to their sayings.

The term 'uṇartal' (realization) in the stanza implies that they understand the nature of the individual self and the supreme self through a knowledge of the Śivāgamas which are to be listened to from a competent master. The adjectival clause 'who has them as their bondmen and the adverbial class of reason as 'they have us as their bondmen' imply that the individual selves are possessed by the Supreme self and we are possessed by the realized selves as bondmen.

The objects possessed are of two kinds : one the bondmen who belong to the category of the selves and the other the things possessed namely māyā and the deeds and all their effects.

Here it is said that the realization of the Supreme self should follow the realization of oneself. But in Sivaprakāśam which is the tertiary says that by knowing the supreme self with its grace, one would realize one's own true nature. It also says that if one identified oneself with the supreme, one would realise the supreme bliss which is omnipresent. Here it says that the realization of the supreme is the consequence of the realization of one's self.

These dicta are apparently contradictory. But if one knows the stage of realization which go by the name dasakārya (ten activities of wisdom) one would understand the harmony in the expressions. Sivaprakāśam speaks of ātma darsana which occurs after Sivarūpa and ātmasuddhi which is the result of Sivadarsana. But here the author of the primary indicates Sivapperu which is the result of ātma-suddhi (union which is the consequence of purgation). In the ninth sūtra the author has occasion to say that one should realize the Lord with His grace and thereby realize one self. Here also the non-contradiction is clear.

dictory character of the revealed expression should be realized. Here the expression means that the soul's nature will be revealed only when the supreme is known with His grace, which is technically spoken of as obtaining ātmadarśana from śivarūpa.

From what is explained of the first two lines it should be known that it is only those who have realized the highest value of life that are indicated in the first line. Such persons are not different from the supreme. So it is said that they have the author as their bondmen. The expression 'those that have not known themselves' is a general one, and it will include the materialists who have not realized their own existence, the Buddhists, the Sāṅkhyas, the māyāvadins who have not realized themselves as qualified ones, and all those followers of religions who do not hold themselves as being dependent on the Supreme. The Pāncarātrins hold themselves as being atomic in nature and misunderstand the non-supreme as the Supreme and consider the supreme as undergoing change, so they too are to be considered as not knowing themselves. The Sivādvaitins attribute change to the inseparable consciousness Force of the Supreme. For this and other reasons, they too should be considered as not realizing themselves.*⁶

The implication of the last two lines of the stanza is as follows :

To have an adequate conception of an elephant one should possess the power to see and should speak of it on the strength of the determinate perception one had of it. But suppose several blind men want to form an idea of the form of an elephant. The only way in which they could achieve their object is to feel the various parts of the elephant with the tactile sense and speak of it as being of the shape of the winnowing implement which is used for separating the husk from the grain or cylindrical stick, slope of the hill etc. Similar is the position of persons who are not gifted with the eye of grace which is granted by an enlightened master. They will study the various scriptures and formulate the conception of the eternal verities which will be one sided. It is only a person who is gifted with the grace of an enlightened master that can give a complete idea of the eternal verities which will include all the various one sided aspects of them formulated by the

* The implication of 'and for other reasons' may be taken to be their perspectives of the Supreme as being Nimittōpādāna (efficient as well as material cause) that the Supreme has determinate knowledge of wordly things for the sake of individual selves etc.

blind men. But if such a man speaks of the whole and points out that their concepts were one sided and partial inas muchas they derived them from the knowledge of the ear or the feet, the trunk, the side etc. of the elephant. They will not realize the truth but consider such a person as one among themselves and will not give any credit to his saying. It is a well known proverb in the Tamil land that a pair of tongs and an ignorant person will grasp a thing inescapably (kotirum petaiyum koṇdatu vidatu). So the enlightened man will simply laugh at such persons and pass on knowing the true nature of the persons.

The work Sivajnana Bodham is such as to point out the synthesis of truth which includes the various particular aspects that are expounded regarding the eternal verities in the various religious scriptures. This is the implication of the saying of Meykandar that we would not attach significance to their sayings.

The various other religions may be classified under four heads the outermost, the outer, the inner-outer and the inner. The six religions materialism, the four kinds of Buddhism and Jainism are to be classified as the outermost. The Nyāyā school, the Mimāṃsa school, the Advaita School, the Sāṅkhya, the Yōga and the Pāncarātra are the six kinds of outer schools. Pāsūpata, Māvratā, Kāpala, Vāma, Vairava and the Aikyavāda Saiva form the six schools under the classification of the inner-outer. The six schools from Pāṣāṇa vāda to the Śivādvaita mentioned in Sankarṇa nīrākaraṇa are the inner schools. All these twenty four schools may be included in the broad divisions of the inner schools and the outer schools.

It is worth noting that there is similarity between the classification into two or four kinds of the values of life according to the needs of the content of the Tamil grammar Tolkāppiyam. Even though the religions may be classified into two kinds as inner and outer, we prefer the classification into four kinds as above in order to further distinguish between them. Similarly Tolkāppiyam has divided the values of life into two kinds inner and outer (aham and puram). Since there was further distinction among those values the grammatical work by the name Pannirupatalam has classified the same values under four heads, the outermost, the outer, the inner-outer and the inner. Those who cannot understand the reason for the classification will

prefer one classification to the other and will wrongly think that the other is a defective one.

Among the various religionists the six religionists from the materialists to the Jains do not attach any significance either to the Vēdas or to the Śivāgamas and are atheists. But still they admit particular books as scriptures and follow definite principles in their life. So they are recognised as religionists belonging to the outermost schools.

The six categories from the logicians to the Pāncarātrins do not attach importance to the Āgamas. They hold the Vēdas as authoritative in general. But among them the logicians do not hold the theory of intrinsic validity (svataḥ pramāṇa) to the knowledge. Further in their scheme of categories they hold the views which are contradictory to the Vēdas ; the Mīmamsakas hold the ritual portion of the Vēdas alone as being authoritative and discard the wisdom portions which are called upaniṣads. The Advaitins (monists) hold the wisdom portions of the Vēdas alone as authoritative and discard the ritual portions. The other three namely the Sāṅkhyas, the Yōgins and the Vaiṣṇavites attach importance to the vēdic texts that are conducive to their interpretation and discard other portions ; further they hold authoritative the books that are contradictory to the Vēdas. So their religions are classified as belonging to the outer section.

The five religionists from the Pāśupatas hold the Vēdas and Śivāgamas authoritative in a general way. But they give special importance to the works like Pāśupata sūtras etc. Further in their practices they adopt rituals prohibited by the Vēdas. The last category the Aikya vāda Saivaites give special importance to both the vēdas and the Śivāgamas. They also observe meticulously the prescriptions enjoined in them. But they do not accept the existence of the spiritual impurity which is the root cause for all the troubles in life. They also discredit the passages of the Śivāgamas that speak of its existence. For these reasons the above six schools are separated as a group under the heading inner-outer.

The six schools from Pāṣana vāda Saivas have the advantage of accepting both the vēdas and the Āgamas even as the Saivasiddhāntins do. They only differ in classifying the characteristics of the eternal verities as general and special. So they are classified as a separate

group called the inner. In this way the distinction between the Saiva-siddhānta and the various other schools should be known.

In picking out the religions under the classification inner, discretion and care have to be exercised. In the Sankarpanirākaraṇa nine religions have been stated and refuted. Of these the first one māyāvāda belongs to the category of the outer one. The second which is Aikya-vāda Śaiva belongs to the category of the inner-outer. There remain seven religions from Pāṣānavāda Saivism to suddha Saivism. The sixth one is described as nimitta kāraṇa pariṇāma vāda Śaivism. Of these two we have to decide what Umāpati means by Śivādvaita Saiva in his statement, ' that Saiva siddhānta is beyond the ken of the religions from Lōkayata to Śivādvaita*. We have to conclude that Śivādvaita is the penultimate one as per Sankarpanirākaraṇam and it is given the name *nimitta kāraṇa pariṇāma vāda*. It should be remembered that Śivādvaita Śaivites hold that the *Consciousness-force* which is called the *Lord's grace*, evolves into the seen universe. So Suddha Saivism may be treated as being included in Saiva Siddhānta as there is not much difference in concepts of the eternal verities between the two religions. Some people think that suddha śaiva should be taken as śivādvaita śaiva ; but this is not admissible.

Umāpati Śivam while giving the distinctive features of śaiva-siddhānta says that the system will not be understood by the people who belong to the outer circle and it will be something like darkness to them. For those religionists who are classified as belonging to the inner circle, it will be like light when explained. From this we have to conclude that all those that have conceived and admit their existence of the six eternal categories, viz., the one (supreme), the many (individual selves), the darkness (spiritual), the deeds, and the two material causes of the cosmos, suddha māyā and asuddha māyā belongs to the inner circle and all others belong to the outer circles. There is also a tradition which considers *suddha śaiva* as belonging to the inner circle as something different from śaiva siddhānta. Thus in *śivajñana siddhi* saint Arulnandi says, that the six religionists from the followers of the suddha śaivism onwards will enjoy the experiences that are provided from the worlds that belong to the pure evolutes, suddha vidya onwards. Here of the seven religions from Pāṣāna vāda to suddha saiva

* Sivaprakasa-Special, 49.

indicated in Sankarpan nirakarana, the first (Pāṣāṇa vāda) and the second (Bhēda vāda) should be taken as being identical, since there is not much philosophical difference in their imports.

One may be tempted to take the meaning of 'meytaru saivamādi iru mūnrum' as Pāśupata etc., that have been classified as inner-outer. But the religionists belonging to the category of Pāśupatas and others do not believe in the existence of the material elements which are beyond kalā. So it is not proper to hold that a person ignorant of the existence of the suddha tattvas would reach the worlds belonging to those tattvas after their present life and enjoy fruits therein. The sixth group Aikya vāda śaiva of course believes in the existence of the pure evolutes suddha vidya etc. But they do not recognize the existence of the spiritual darkness which is called āṇava. So it is not proper to say that those persons can enjoy experiences obtained in the pure tattvas. It is only those that recognise the existence of the root impurity that can enjoy the pleasure in the pure elements. The proper place for the enjoyment of the Aikyavāda śaivites after this life is the evolutes which are above asuddha māyā, but below śuddha vidya. It is stated in Pauṣkara etc., that there are pure evolutes from earth onwards upto kalā that are derived from the pure māyā. They are the place for the enjoyment of the released selves from among Aikya-vāda saivites. They are also the locus for the living of the vijñāna kalas who are considered to be bound by the spiritual impurity alone.

OUTERMOST RELIGIONS

Lokayata or Carvaka

The lokayata, belonging to the section of the outermost, accepts perception alone as the valid means of knowledge. Accordingly the four elements the earth, water, fire and air are the four eternal elements. The Embodiment is a product of these four elements. In the conjunction of these four elements an awareness is caused even as red colour is the product of the proportionate mingling of betel leaves, lime and arecanut. This awareness grows with the growth of and decays with the decay of the embodiment. So it is wrong to say that the knowing self is different from the embodiment. Pleasure and pain are natural and inherent to the body. So to attribute them to the presence of an unknown *karma* is also wrong. We do not see

any person who has produced the peacock with beautiful colours and endowed the cuckoo with the sweet tongue. So as to say that there is a god who has created the world is also wrong.

To spend time happily in married life or in association with women with adequate food and clothing is the only heavenly pleasure existent. Losing such pleasure, if a man suffers from enemies, diseases, poverty, reading books or such other causes such suffering is the painful experience of the hell. To believe in the existence of heaven or hell different from these is not correct. Of the four elements if the life-breath disappears, the body loses its awareness and gets disintegrated. This is salvation. As against death it is incorrect to believe that there is an eternal life which is called salvation or freedom or *nirvana*. Those who are ignorant of this truth believe in a life after death and suffer from penances fasting and by doing other rituals. The works that insist on the chastity of women are written by those that are in want of health, but are gifted with common sense. Those works which praise the gifts of wealth, land and food are really written by men of poverty who have suffered from hunger. The books that praise the construction of temples, the digging of wells, establishment of cool gardens and watersheds have been the creation of travellers. So these things may safely be ignored and attention may be paid to agriculture, rearing of cattle, commerce, the art of ruling a country etc., which are prescribed by men of learning and these should be followed in order to live a happy life in this world.

The originator in the form of a book of this school of thought is considered to be Brahaspati, the teacher of the celestials. The materialists may be classified variously as those who take the body as the self, the sense organs as the self, the life breath as the self and the internal organs as the self.

BUDDHISM

This was founded by Buddha. He is considered to be one who has undergone several incarnations observing moral principles so that he might have pure knowledge by which to attain release. In his unbounded love that others also should similarly attain release, he has given the scriptural work, *tripitaka*.

According to that scripture the self is of the form of *jñāna*. It is continuous and momentary even like the flow of water in a stream. At every moment it makes its appearance and then disappears. Since the residual impression of the *Jñāna* that disappears passes on to the new *jñāna*, we feel the continuity of the knowledge, in spite of its momentariness. This is like the fragrance of the musk clinging to an object placed in a box even after musk itself is removed.

In this manner all those things that are considered to be entities are momentary, characterised by instantaneous origin and end. The destruction of the residual impressions of the *jñāna* is release. There are some who state that the cessation of even the *jñāna* is release.

Buddhism is classified under four heads, *madhyamika*, *yogacara*, *Sautrāntika* and *Vaibhāshika*. These four classes respectively hold that all things are illusory, external things are illusory, the existence of external things is known by inference, the external things are objects of perception. The upholders of these four kinds were the disciples of the original Buddha.

Madhyamika School

Worldly things, if they are real, will not be destroyed ; if they are unreal, will not appear. If we say that they are real and unreal, it is contradictory. If those things are neither real nor unreal they will not appear in the stream of consciousness of ours. Since they do not come under any of these four kinds they are illusory (*sunya*). Because of ignorance they appear to be perceptible. So said the master, according to the scripture. The disciples accepted the dictates of the master and did not further question him. These are the *madhyamikas*.

Since these disciples attached importance to the sayings of the master they are the disciples of the first grade or perfect (*uttaman*) and since they did not question the master further they are to be classed under last grade (*adamas*). As these two characteristics are simultaneously founded in this class, it is described as middling or *madhyamikar*.

Yogacara School : When the disciples heard the instruction from the master as above, they accepted that external things were illusory. But if knowledge also of those things was to be considered illusory, then there would be no basis for orderly life and communication.

So a set of them raised the difficulty before the master. The master appreciated the intelligence of the disciples and further explained the matter. He said that cognition is there. It is of two kinds, one with forms (*sākāram*), the other without the forms (*nirākāram*). Of these two kinds the awareness in the form of circle, square, black and red is to be described as with form (*sākāram*). In the state of release these differences cease to exist and the awareness streams forth continuously without any difference. This consciousness is without form. Consciousness of this nature is the only thing which exists. In the state of dream mere consciousness without an external object enables a man to have experience. So also the state of wakefulness should be deemed to be of a similar nature. This consciousness occurs only from within, but owing to the beginningless ignorance it appears to be taking place externally i.e., we project our ideas externally. So concluded the master. Those that were instructed thus accepted what the master said at first and further questioned him. So they are called *Yogacaras*. The word *acara* means in Buddhism acceptance of the master's words and further questioning is denoted by the term *yoga*. *Yogacara* is a compound of these two terms.

Sautrāntika School : After listening to the second lesson from the master some of the disciples argued thus : To take the external objects as illusory is not proper. When we are aware that ' I perceived this ', the ' I ' in the sentence represents the perceiver which is the inner self. ' This ' represents the object which is perceived externally. From the expression itself the internal nature of ' I ' and the external nature of ' this ' are clear. Simply because both are apprehended simultaneously, it is not proper to assign identity to them. Since the expressions are different the objects denoted by them should also be different. So it is not proper to say that the mere awareness of the pot, the cloth etc., is appearing as pot, cloth etc., outside. When such an argument was put forth the master listened to it with appreciation and made his observation as follows : Even the external things are real entities, but they are not things perceived by us. Unless the consciousness of the shape of the pot is apprehended, it is not possible to know the pot ; the pot etc., which are momentary will not last till we understand them. So when the pot etc., leave their impression on our mind and perish, from the impression alone we conceive the pot etc., which have already perished. So it is only by inference that we come to know of the external things. If we enter into the nature of

things that cause this kind of knowledge we have to formulate the following things. There are two kinds of aggregates, external and internal. Of these the external aggregates are earth etc. Their primary constituents are atoms. The atoms are of four kinds namely those of the earth, those of water, those of fire, and those of air. When these atoms gather together the external aggregate appears.

Again the internal aggregate consists of mind and its constituents. Their causes may be divided into five principles. They are form, feeling, awareness, name and residual impression. These are denoted by the word 'skandha' which means aggregate.

The forms are sound etc., that are conceived by our mind. Even though these are external to us, yet since they are conceived by internal faculty they are classed under internal aggregate. There is also another school of thought which takes the body and the sense organs, which are of us as the aggregate of form. Awareness of the aggregate of form is the aggregate of awareness (*Jnanaskandha*). This is also known as *vijnana* which is classified into (1) what has form and (2) what is without form. The *vijnana* which flows outward is known as *pravrtti vijnana* and this is with the form. The *vijnana* which is free from any form is denoted by the term *ālaya vijnana*. These are also denoted by the term *savikalpaka jnana* and *nirvikalpaka jnana*.

Feeling is the result of the aggregate of awareness which takes the form of pleasure, pain or apathy (or indifference). The names Rama, Krishna etc., which we use to denote things are called the aggregate of names. There is a school of thought which says that the determinate awareness which is the result of indication by names is the aggregate of names and the indeterminate awareness alone is classed under the aggregate of awareness. The residue of these things is called residual impressions. The term *kuri* (குறி) and *samijnai* (சமிஞ்ஞை) are equivalents. The terms *vasana*, (notion) and *seikai* (செய்கை) are equivalents. When these five elements come together, we have what is called internal aggregate. Of these five the aggregate of form will be placed among the external aggregates according to some scholars and the remaining four alone are classified as internal aggregates. The whole world can be brought under these two aggregates, so said the master.

After listening to this discourse the disciples said that the master was explaining things to his disciples so as to suit their questions. So

they were eager to know how long would it take to come to the end of the *sūtras* or discourses. Since they asked for the end of the *sūtras*, they were designated by the master as *sautrantikas*—those who inquired about the end of the *sūtras*.

Vaibhāsika School : When the disciples heard what the master said, they further argued thus. Why should external things be taken as inferential ones? Since knowledge itself is self revealing, and since there is no perceptible object it is not possible to establish the concomitant relation which is an important ingredient in all inferential knowledge so what the master had spoken to them was self-contradictory. Since they raised the question of internal contradiction in the words of the master, they were called *Vaibhāsikas*. The word ' *vibhāsa* ' means internal contradiction. To those people the master explained that the external things were to be taken as things perceived.

Even though the school of Buddhism has been expounded in four ways so as to suit the mental ability of those that questioned the master, yet the doctrine of momentariness and the aggregate nature of the world is accepted by all of them. So in the opinion of the master all of them should understand the world to be void or illusory. Since the disciples held whatever they heard from the master to be the final truth, Buddhism has come to be regarded as being classified into four kinds.

ĀRUHATHAM (JAINISM)

Jainism recognizes seven categories, the *jiva*, *jaiva*, *āsrava*, *saṃvara*, *nirjara*, *bandha* and *mukti*. Among these the *jiva* is of three kinds, *anadi siddha*, the released (*mukta*) and the bound one. *Anadi siddha* is the *Arhat*. The released are the souls which are released from bondage. Bound selves (*baddhas*) are those that are weighted by the eight principle of bondage—the delusion (*moha*), perishability, (*antharaya*), heritage (*gotram*), name (*namam*), duration (*āyusyam*), sufferings (*vedaniyam*), obscuration of sight (*darsanāvaraniyam*), obscuration of wisdom (*jñanāvaraniyam*).

The self is the knowing principle, is different from body to body and is of the size of the gross body. *Ajiva* consists of four kinds the *pudgala*, *ākasa*, the *dharma* and *adharma*. Of these *pudgala* consists of the four elements, the earth, water, fire and air and their products,

the immovable and movable. The immovables are the trees, grass etc. The movables are those that are born from the egg, placenta etc. The *pudgalas* are originated from the atoms. *Akasa* is of two kinds, that which is within the worlds and that which transcends them. *Dharma* is the good, which is other than *pudgala*. *Adharma* is the evil.

Dharma is considered to be the nature of the *jivas* to soar higher up in the ether even as the wings of a bird enable it to soar higher up in the sky. *Adharma* on the other hand is the nature of the soul which keeps it down like the feet of the birds. These terms are generally pronounced with the formula *astikaya* added to it.

Asrava is the nature of the self to be attracted by the senses. It is also considered by some as the continuation of *karma*.

Samvara is the opposite of *asrava* i.e., prevention of the mind from the way of the senses directing it towards the way of release. It takes the form of care towards the living beings such as the ants by walking softly so that they may not be destroyed, uttering kind words, and taking prescribed food.

Nirjara is the penance such as lying on a hard and hot bed (*suduparai*) and plucking one's hair from one's head. Bondage consists of the eight elements which drag down the self into the ocean of birth even is iron cover sinks a floating fruit down into the water.

Release is the soaring of the self higher up into the transcendental ether even as a floating fruit regains its original status when the iron cover is removed. Some are of the opinion that the state of release is remaining in the higher regions of the transcendental ether.

One peculiarity about this school is to answer all questions in a pattern of seven possible ways. For example the question whether there was a self before its embodiment is to be answered in the following pattern of seven ways.

- (1) may be there was,
- (2) may be there was not,
- (3) may be there was and there wasn't,
- (4) may be indeterminable,
- (5) may be there was and indeterminable,
- (6) may be there wasn't and indeterminable, and
- (7) may be there was and wasn't and indeterminable.

All questions should be answered likewise in the seven possible ways. This is called *syādāvda* or *anekānta vāda*. This is also denoted as *sapta pangti nyaya*.

This pattern implies no contradiction because the intention is that the truths may be or may not be one of these. This is superior to those answers which commit themselves to anyone of the limitations.

Saint Tirujnana Sambandar who attacks Jainism and Buddhism as against the orthodox schools of thought characterises them respectively as the sceptics and the agnostics. In fact he called the Jains as the doubting Jains and Buddhists as the empty Buddhists.

Of these various schools the materialists (*lokayatas*) are those that base their arguments on perception alone. The Buddhists are those that argue for the momentariness of the things. The *arhats* are those that argue in seven possible ways. Among the Buddhists, the *madhya mikas* are called nihilists (*sunyavadins*), the *yogacaras* are called subjective idealists (*vijnanavadins*), whereas the other two schools are called the theorists of aggregate (*samudayavadins*).

PURACCAMAYAM

The following schools of thought are classed under external circle. They are *Tarka* which comprises of the two schools *Vaisesika* and *Nyaya*, *Mimamsa*, *Ekanmavada*, *Sankhya*, *Yoga* and *Pancaratra*. Of these the *Vaisesika* accepts the seven categories, *dravya*, *guna*, *karma*, *jati*, *visesa*, *samavaya* and *a'hava*.

Dravya (substance) consists of the nine things earth, water, fire, air, ether, time, direction, the self and the mind. Of these the four categories from the earth onwards are transient. The atoms that constitute the four elements earth, water, fire and air, are enduring entities. Ether, time, direction, the self and the mind are also enduring entities.

Of these ether, time and direction are each one only and are all-pervasive. The selves are all pervasive and are infinite in number. The mind is atomic in nature and is different with different selves. The self is of two kinds, the supreme self and the individual self. The supreme self is all knowing and omnipotent. The world has its origin

and destruction according to the will power of the supreme self. He is the author of the *Vedas*. The individual selves are of limited knowledge and they undergo birth and death according to their *karma* and experience pleasure and pain. The individual self has consciousness, only when in contact with the mind.*

Quality : The qualities are those that manifest themselves with the support of what are called substances. They are colour, taste, smell, touch etc., and are twenty four in number. Of these *buddhi* or knowledge is one. Knowledge, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, effort, good and evil are eight qualities that characterise the individual self. Residual impression which is also called *bhavana* is a characteristic of the individual self. The residual impression is the effect of experience and is the cause of memory. Of these consciousness, will and desire are the characteristics of the universal self. These three characteristics of the universal self are ever-lasting, whereas these three of the individual self are transient. Actions are classified as five in number. They are rising, falling, bending, straightening and walking.

Jati or the universal is that which is common to a class of things. It is of two kinds, the higher kind which includes the lower and the lower kind which forms part of the higher (*para & apara*).

Visesa or the specific quality is that which pertains to the individual thing. They are the differentiating principles among everlasting atoms and the five everlasting things and are many.

Samavaya is the inseparable relation between the whole and its part, the substance and its quality etc., and is only one.

Abhava or non-existence is of four kinds namely, prior non-existence, posterior non-existence, mutual non-existence and eternal non-existence. In this way if the specific and general characteristics and otherness of the seven categories are distinctly understood by a person, he will be able to distinguish things and consequently is aware of his individual self. As he distinguishes the nature of the individual self, the illusory knowledge which confuses the individual self with the

* According to the Tārṅikas, consciousness is not a natural property either to the individual self or to the mind, but is an adventitious one, manifesting itself when there is contact between the individual self and its mind.

embodiment etc., will disappear. As it disappears there will be no effort on the part of the individual. In consequence there will be no good or bad deeds performed by the individual. In the absence of these deeds, there will be no cause for reincarnation. The deeds which have been brought by the present birth to be experienced will be exhausted by experience and there will be no cause for effecting further contact between the mind and the self. So the self will remain without awareness, like a stone. This is the state of liberation. The author of the *Vaisesika* system is Kanada.

The system of *Nyaya* traverses the same ground, with different classification of the same categories. It recognizes sixteen categories, *pramana*, *prameya*, *doubt*, *use*, *analogy*, *conclusion*, the syllogistic parts, arguments leading the opponents to contradiction (*tarka*), establishing the truth, discussion, failing to establish one's proposition, cavil, fallacy, partiality, obscurantism, and occasion for reproach.

The scriptural author of this system is *Aksapada* or Gautama. The logicians who are of two kinds, the *Vaisesika* and *Naiyayika* recognize momentariness for certain things. So these are called *ardha vainasikas*. The Buddhists attribute momentariness to all things. So they are called the complete *vainasikas*. To cite how the logicians attribute momentariness to certain things we may consider the following, food which we take build up the parts of our body which decay and grow ; so our body itself undergoes decay and growth every moment and it should be considered to be different at different instants. Though we are not aware of the changes that occur every instant the resultant change will be seen at the end of a particular duration even as the amount of water in a well which is pumped out is refilled by its own springs. Similarly the earth changes every moment by removal of mud and refill and the ocean by the flow of water from the rivers and by the formation of clouds. They attribute momentariness to some such things.

The *Sautrantikas* and *Vaibhasikas* among the Buddhists, the Jains and the *Tarkikas* are atomists in general. But the Buddhists and the Jains say that atoms become products by aggregation. The *Tarkikas* say that the atoms form into effects by a process which is called *aram'ha*. According to this process, the atoms become active by divine will, and combine themselves into twos and become double atoms. These double atoms combine together in threes and become

triple atoms. These triple ones combine together in fours and become quadruple atoms. In this way the world is being created in an orderly way and by the divine will it will be resolved similarly in the reverse order by retracing the same steps.

The *Tarkikas* and the Buddhists classify atoms into four kinds as belonging to the earth, water, fire and air. But the Jains take all atoms to be similar. Even though the *Tarkikas* entertain the idea of momentariness yet since they accept the *Vedas* as valid means of knowledge and act according to their dictates, they are separated from the heterodox group and are grouped under the Orthodox classes.

Mimamsa System : *Mimamsa* is a work of investigation of the ritual portions of the *Vedas*. Since the ritual portions are generally known by the term *Veda*, *Mimamsa* is also known as the *Veda*. The work has been executed by Jaimini and it consists of twelve chapters. The content of the work may be summarised as follows : As the *Vedas* were not created by any person and are self-existent they are valid means of knowledge. It will be seen that even among the contents of the *Vedas* those sentences which are of the form of imperatives, for example 'bathe daily', 'perform the sacrifice' and 'perform worship' are the only structures that can claim to be valid means of knowledge. It is only through the imperatives that sentences reveal their meanings to the learned. A person who wishes to know the meaning of sentences observes the action done by the persons who is enjoined to bind the cow. He also observes the action of the same person when enjoined to untie the buffalo. From the observation he comes to know the meaning of the nouns, 'cow' and 'buffalo', and also the meaning of the verbs in the imperative 'bind' and 'untie'. This is the way in which one learns the meaning of the words, i.e. only through the imperative sentences. So even in the *Vedas* it is only the imperatives that can reveal their meanings and become valid. The informative sentences like 'The world has its origin and destruction'. 'There is a God who originates and destroys the world', are unable to reveal their meaning and so are not valid. There are sentences that contain the names of the deities like Indra, and their description. Strictly speaking these cannot be taken to be valid. But still such of them as will be helpful in the performance of the imperatives may be accepted to be valid because of the need. Such *mantras* as 'Indraya svaha', 'Varunaya svaha' are not strictly speak-

ing valid, but still they too are accepted to be valid since they are helpful in carrying out of the imperatives. The naming words such as *gyotistoma*, and *Asvameda* enable us to distinguish between sacrifices and so are to be accepted as valid. In this way even those expressions of the *vedas* which are not imperatives are accepted to be valid as they aid in the interpretation and understanding of the imperatives. This is by courtesy usage.

Thus all the Vedic statements may be classified into four kinds as (1) Imperatives, (2) figuratives, *mantras* and the names. Of these four, imperatives are primaries whereas the other three are secondaries. The imperatives are of two kinds, injunction and prohibition. Accordingly man's actions which follow those imperatives fall into two classes virtue and vice.

In the Vedas there is the injunction 'know the self.' So the selves are many, everlasting, all-pervading, subject to birth and death performing deeds and experiencing their fruits. For those who perform deeds, deeds by themselves will fructify and place the doer in heaven and other places of experience. If one desires the fruits of a deed enjoined in the Vedas, the deed itself will confer its respective fruit. If the same deed is performed without any desire for its fruits and if a person carefully refrains from prohibited deeds, the deed of performing sacrifice will confer liberation on the performer. To say that there is a Supreme Being other than the individual self and to hold that the world is subject to origination and destruction are not true. The world will continue to be everlasting as it is. The *sutras* which are composed to this effect by Jaimini have been commented upon by the sage Sabara. Kumarila Bhatta noted some deviations in the commentary from the *sutras*. So he composed a secondary work purely based on the *sutras* alone. But his disciple Prabhakara composed a secondary work based on the commentary itself. Thus there are two versions of the same school of thought, *Mimamsa*. Bhattacharya asserts that the deeds by themselves will confer their fruits and he holds, like the *Naiyayikas*, that there is bliss in the state of release. But Prabhakara affirms that a principle named *apurva* comes into existence when the deed undergoes destruction after its performance and that *apurva* confers the fruits of the action. He also holds, like the *Vaisesikas* that in the state of release there is no bliss but it is only a state of unawareness like the existence of a stone.

Prabhakara also affirms certain variations in the nature of the categories which differ from what Bhattacharya has given. The school of Prabhakara is also known as *guru mada*.

Of the twelve chapters the first chapter first *pada* deals with the validity of the Vedas as they are self-existent. He also refutes in that *pada* the *prima facie* views ascribing invalidity to the imperatives. In the second *pada* it establishes the validity for the figuratives and the *mantras* as they prescribe the substances for the prayers etc. which are required in carrying out the imperatives. In the third *pada* the validity of *smrtis* by Manu and others is established as it is inferred that they have their originals in the Vedas and as they do not contradict the Vedic sayings. In the fourth *pada* the terms that designate the sacrifices are stated to be valid for the reason that they enable us to distinguish between the deeds and enable us also to know what is referred to by similarity and repetition. The first chapter in this way establishes the validity of the Vedic sayings. So it is called the chapter on validity.

The second chapter is designated chapter on *karma bheda*. The deeds which are obtained by valid vedic sayings differ from one another by the difference in the primary deeds. The same deed is expressed many times. They are also enumerated. They are termed differently. The difference in their characteristics is mentioned. Some are uttered in a different context. By these means the differentiation between the deeds should be established.

The third chapter is designated *angangi iyal*. *Angi* is the primary, *angam* is the secondary that depends on it. The chapter distinguishes between the primary and the secondary by the indicators *sruti*, *linga*, *vakya*, *prakarana*, locus and designation. Of the six indicators *sruti* is that which independently indicates its intention. It is of three kinds namely the term of injunction, the term of designation and the term of description.

The *linga* is that which reveals its meaning by its potentiality. The potentiality is of two kinds, word potentiality and meaning potentiality. From the deed that is indicated by a *mantra*, the *mantra* is considered to be a secondary to the deed. This belongs to word potentiality. When it is enjoined in general that a sacrificial offer should be received with implement, with the ladle or with the hand,

one has to know that the implement should be used in the case of flesh, that the ladle should be used, in the case of liquid offers, and the hand should be used in other cases. This is how the intention is determined with respect to potentiality of things.

Vakya is the collocation of words, other than *sruti* and *linga*, which reveals the intention. *Prakarana* is the indication known by the topic. The topic is known by the imperative of a general mention which however remains incomplete so long as special mention is given later on. 'Do the Sacrifice of *Jyotistoma*' is an example of an imperative which introduces the *prakarana* and is completed by the special rules which follow. It is of two kinds, the main and the intermediary.

Locus is of two kinds namely the respective arrangement of mention and the proximity. Proximity is again of two kinds, proximity of the mention and the proximity of action.

Designation is the name assigned to a thing by virtue of its nature. It is of two kinds according as it follows the tradition of the Vedas or the tradition of the worldly life. This way the six indicators are to be understood.

The fourth chapter deals with the application of the deeds according as they are the primaries or the secondaries. In Sanskrit it is called the chapter on *prayoga*. When the secondary goes wrong in order to fulfil the requirements of the primary another secondary is the requisite. If the primary itself goes wrong, no primary is required for the sake of the secondaries. If the secondary goes wrong and if it has several primaries (and if the secondary itself is a primary) the primary for which the secondary has gone wrong should be replaced not for the sake of others. These are the illustrations of the rules of application given in this chapter.

The fifth chapter deals with the order in which the primaries and the secondaries are to be performed. They are to be performed according to the order in which they are mentioned in the *sruti* or they may take the order subjectwise or they may follow the order in which they are mentioned. These are carefully examined and the suitable order is chosen. So this chapter deals with the order of performance. From the above it will be known that the second chapter deals with the difference in the performance which is to be known from

the imperative of origination (உற்பத்தி விதி). The third chapter deals with the primary and the secondary which are known from the imperatives which are aiding ones. In the fourth and fifth chapter the application of the performance which is known from the applying imperatives is explained. After these, the sixth chapter explains the competent ones by giving the fruits. So the chapter is known as the chapter on fruits. It is also known as the chapter on competence. These four imperatives which respectively deal with the origination, the aid, the application and the competence (qualification) are expressly dealt with. So these are called explicit imperatives and these are dealt with in the first six chapters. The explicit imperatives are those that directly express the prescription. The four chapters from the seventh to the tenth investigate the imperatives which express themselves by similarity.

The seventh chapter deals with the imperatives which are expressed in words that a particular thing is to be done in the manner in which another particular is done. Where there are no express injunction the similarity in the names is taken for the hint. Even if there is no similarity in the name, the similarity is inferred from the way in which the imperative is mentioned. In these ways the seventh chapter deals with the imperatives of similarity (மாட்டேற்றியல்).

The eighth chapter distinguishes the manner of performance from the similarity of expression and the similarity of meaning. By the consideration of these two similarities the eighth chapter determines the action to be performed and the manner of the action which is to be followed. So this chapter is also known as the chapter on similarity (மாட்டேற்றியல்).

The ninth chapter deals with the inferences in doing things by observing similarity. When we follow similarity we have to observe certain *mantras*, *samas* and actions in the case of principal actions. The respective changes in them while adopting them in auxiliary deeds are to be inferred by implication. The tenth chapter deals with exceptional cases while the implication by the mode of similarity is inferred. The exceptions are decided as per certain rules and regulations. Hence this chapter is known as the chapter on exception.

The eleventh chapter deals with discretion (*tantra*) that is to be used in the performance. When a deed is performed and the primary

deeds are many and if it pertains to the same place, the same time, and the same doer, it is enough if one secondary deed is performed once and for all. The secondary deed which is to be performed once again is specially named as *avapa*.

The twelfth chapter is named the chapter on *prasanga*. The food prepared for the master who has come first, may also be used to the son-in-law who also is to be treated with dignity and affection likewise. Similarly the deed performed with respect to one function may also be used as a requisite for another function as well, the relationship is called *prasanga*. It should be carefully noted that it is not *prasanga* to make use of the food prepared for the master to those who accompany him as well.

The rules of investigation which are dictated by the school of *Nyaya* and the methodology that is delineated in the *Mimamsa* will be useful in all works pertaining to other schools of thought. So the rules and the methodology are to be followed in other schools of thought as well and they are common ones.

EKATMAVADAM (MONISM)

Monism is of four kinds, *mayavada*, *parinamavada* followed by *Bhaskara*, *Kritabrahmavada*, and *Sabdabrahma vada*. Of these *maya-vada* is as follows :

Brahman is of the nature of *sat-cit-ananda*, eternal and omnipresent. In the ultimacy, it is the only reality, all other things, being illusory, having Brahman as their support even as the appearance of silver has for its support, nacre. The substantial cause for the appearance of the world, *maya* is indeterminable either as real or unreal or both real and unreal. The realization that the individual self is Brahman itself, other than *maya*, is the state of release. This is achieved by a true knowledge of the contents of the concluding portion of the Vedas.

The *parinamavada* followed by *Bhaskara* Brahman which has the qualities as described above transformed itself into the world of sentient and non-sentient things. Ignorance of this fact is bondage. In the ultimate analysis, there is one Reality. By the study of Vedanta, the nature of self which is other than embodiment will be

clear. To realize that the self itself is Brahman, and to merge in it, is the state of release.

Kṛita brahma vada : 'I am the pure Brahman. I play in conjunction with many things which are subject to modification in many ways.' The realization of this truth is the state of release.

Sabda brahma vada : Brahman is of the nature of expression in the form of awareness, at the end of the aeon. It expands into the sentient and insentient worlds out of ignorance. To realize that ultimately there is only awareness is the state of release. The author of the book which gives rise to monistic ideas in these four ways is Vyasa (or Badarayana).

The Sankhya system : *Sankhya* recognises twenty four insentient elements. Of these, the twenty fourth is *prakṛti*, which is eternal, pervasive, insentient, of the nature of cause of all things and is of a subtle nature which comprises the three qualities in equal proportion. The effects which originate from this *prakṛti* are twenty three *tattvas* from *buddhi* onwards to earth. The *purusa* is the common name for the aggregate of the selves. It is neither the cause nor the effect. It is other than these twenty four *tattvas*, eternal, pervasive, subtle, many and devoid of knowledge and action. It is of the nature of mere awareness. This *purusa* is always pure and is the same in both the states of bondage and of release. It is unaffected by worldly conjunction even as water on the green leaf of the lotus.

Buddhi or intellect is attached to the beginningless ignorance and the self becomes bounded with awareness of pleasure and pain pertaining to the intellect. Intellect is the modification of *prakṛti*. It is also known as *mahat* and is also designated internal organ. It will modify into the nature of knowledge and pass through the sense organs and fall on the objects of the world. To say that *purusa* acts and *buddhi* knows, is due to the confusion caused by ignorance. Ignorance will cease when *prakṛti* and *purusa* are distinguished or discriminated. The state of distinction is the state of release. To state that there is a God other than *purusa* is false. The author of the work on *Sankhya* is Kapila. It expounds the theories of *satkarya vada* (the subtle existence of the effect in its cause) and the *adhyasa vada* (the appearance of the cause as the effect). The theory *satkarya vada* is useful to Saivism and other such schools, which base their

metaphysics on the theory of *satkarya vada*. The theory of appearance is useful to *mayavada*.

The Yoga school : The twenty five *tattvas* from earth onwards to *purusa* and the states of bondage and release are the same as in the atheistic *Sankhya*. The *yoga*, which has for its parts the eight well known steps, is also a means of release even as the discrimination between the *purusa* and *prakrti*.

There is a Supreme Being which may be enumerated as the twenty sixth *tattva*. He is omniscient, and is the author of scriptures which bring enlightenment to the individual selves. So the Supreme Being is different from the individual selves. The author of the work of this school of thought is Patanjali.

The Pancaratra school : There is the twenty fifth *tattva* by name Vasudeva above the twenty fourth *tattva* which is called *guna*. He is the Supreme Being, from Him originated for the purpose of the creation of the world four deities Krishna, Aniruddha, Makaradvaja and Rauikineya. The whole world of sentient and insentient things is created by these four *vyuhas* ; so all things are the modifications of Vasudeva. It is only by adhering to the scriptural work of Pancaratra and not to the *Vedas*, one can attain the highest state. So to be initiated as per *Pancaratra agama*, to worship Vasudeva and to merge in the body of Vasudeva is the state of release.

The author of this work is Vasudeva.*

The schools which form the class internal—external

1. *Pasupata* : The selves are many, eternal, pervasive and are different in the knowledge originated by the combination of effects and causes. The school does not recognise the principle of *anava mala*. *Maya* and *karma* are two elements of bondage of the souls, which experience pleasure and pain. When the fascination of the

* The commentary on the *sūtras* refuting the pāñcarātra view in Brahma sutra 2.2. the school of thought is given as follows :

From Vasudeva, Sankarṣana, the self is originated ; From the self, the mind Pratyumna originates. From the mind the ego, Aniruddha originates. The four *vyūhas* including Vāsudeva are the cause for all the worlds of sentient and insentient things.

world ceases, the self gets initiated and the divine wisdom comes to the person. At the time God leaves His responsibilities to the released soul and is resigned even as a person leaves the household life to his son and takes to ascetic life. The qualities of the Divine pass on to the released soul.

2. *The mahavrata* : The nature of the souls is as above. Those who are initiated as per the scriptures of *mahavrata* and follow the external action such as wearing the garland of bones, will become released. In such released self all the divine qualities arise.

3. *The Kapalika school* : The nature of the self and of the state of bondage is as expressed in the school of *mahavrta*. Those that are initiated according to the scriptures and eat alms collected in skulls and wear green flag in their hands will become released. As Lord Siva inspires them they have all qualities that are in Lord Siva. The Pasupatas become equal to Siva because of the origination of the Lord's qualities, whereas the Kapalikas become equal to Lord Siva by the inspiration of the Lord.

4. *The Vama school* : According to the *Vama* school of thought the world of insentient and sentient beings is the modification of the consciousness-force which is called *sakti*. It enjoins on the aspirant the duty of following the dictates of *Vama* scripture. Release is the merging of the individual self in the consciousness-force, which is called *Sakti*. This scripture was written by Siddha Purusa. The scripture which was delivered by a self residing in the evolute of *sakti* belongs to the school of pure *sakta*. It is the *Vama* of southern way.

5. *The Bhairava school* : This school is in agreement mostly with the *Vama* school. In certain respects it differs in the matter of observances of rituals and holds God *Bhairava* as the Supreme Being. The state of release is the attainment of the locus of *Bhairava*.

6. *The Aikkyavada school* : According to this school there is no *anava mala*. It is only the absence of knowledge that is called *anava*. There are only two principles of bondage namely *maya* and *karma*. The Lord bestows on the individual self the embodiment and other things in accordance with the two deeds performed by him in his previous births; by eating the fruits of the two deeds, the individual self attains equanimity with respect to them. At that opportune

moment, the Lord cleanses the individual self of the principles of bondage and the self becomes free from those bonds and shines with the inherent lustre of perfect knowledge.

The schools which are known as *kalamukha*, *sambhava* etc., will be included as special cases of these schools. The inner schools *pasanavada* etc., should be known from the exposition given in *Sankalpa nirakarana*. Whenever occasion arises, we shall also show their contents. Those schools which are not explicitly dealt with here will fall under these classifications as parts of these schools, which the student will classify according to relevant needs and contents.

GENERAL DIVISION

First Aphorism

Commentary : The author classifies as in the original work of Sanskrit the contents of the work into two great divisions, general and special, and deals with the topic under four subdivisions : the existence, the characteristics, the means and the fruit. While dealing with the existence of the three entities, first of all, the first *sutra* deals with the valid means by which we come to know of the existence of God. The first Aphorism runs as follows.

Aphorism

The world which is of the form, he, she and it, is subject to the three operations and hence it is an entity produced. Because of impurity it comes into Being from the agent of dissolution. So the wise say that the end alone is the beginning.

The substance of the *sutra* is : *God who causes the dissolution of the world is its primal source.*

Dissolution is of five kinds. The first is the dissolution of the evolutes and loci that are included in the *nivrtti kala* ; the second is that of those included in the *pratishtha kala*. The third is that of those included in *Vidya kala*. The fourth is that of those included in the *santi kala*. The last one is of those included in the *santyatita kala*. Of these the proper one according to the content is the last one. So the God of dissolution referred to here is the agent of dissolution which includes all things upto the effects of the pure *maya*, who is known as

Parama Siva. It does not mean the Rudra qualified by *guna*, who resides along with Brahma, and Visnu in the evolute of *guna* and dissolves the worlds which are the effects of *prakrti*. The reason is this : Rudra is not able to dissolve the worlds which are beyond *prakrti*. The *Sivagamas* declare that *Parama siva* has the three manifestations the formless, form and formless and the form respectively in the three states, *laya*, *bhoga* and *adikara* and is named *sakta*, *udhyukta* and *pravrtta* or Siva, Sadasiva and *Mahesvara*. They also declare that the manifestations differ only in functions and not in substance. It is clearly said in the *Agamas* that Srikanta Rudra is a matured self among the *pralayakalas*. So it should be understood that the manifestations down to *Mahesvara* alone are considered independent Supreme Being and the others should not be considered the same way. This is the implication of Meykandar's addition of the attribute *the primal being* besides the noun phrase, *the agent of dissolution* (சங்காரகாரணஞயுள்ள முதலேயே).

This distinction between Maharudra (who is the Supreme Being) and *guni Rudra*, one of the trinities, should be understood and stressed. Saint Manikkavasakar expresses pity for those who cannot distinguish between these two celestials in the word, ' *nammavar avare muvar enre empiranotum enni vinnandu manmel—devar enre irumandu ennapavam tiritavare* '. (Some belonging to our class boasting themselves as the celestials on earth privileged to handle the Vedic injunctions, enumerated the Supreme as one of the trinity, how pitiable it is that they commit sins in this way).

The following also deserve serious consideration. *Sivajnana siddhi* says ' Lord Siva is the moving spirit of the trinity : not knowing this, some people say that he is one of the celestials ' (I. 49). Tiru-jnanasambandhar speaks of the one who is of the form of the trinity, Brahma, Visnu and Isa as desirous of having *Mudukunru* (*virudha-chalam*) as His place of residence ; He is of the form of the celestials, the *asuras*, the *siddhas*, the singer of the Vedas which is pregnant with meaning and He is also of the form of five elements, the earth, the sky, the fire, the air and water. (திருமுதுகுன்றம்—பழந்தக்கராகம்). He also says, 'The Lord of *kayilai* transcends the grasp of the awareness of even Rudra who cannot be conceived of by the lotus-seated creator and the protector who traversed the whole world with his feet : the wise will speak of Him as the great.' Sundarar says in his hymn on

Tirukkanapper that the Lord who has removed the skin of the elephant and wore it as an overcoat will not approach even for an instant the hearts of the cheats. He is the original source and is of the form of the trinity. Saint Tirujnana Sambandar in his *Tiruelu kurrirukkai* speaks of the Supreme as having assumed the three forms in order to originate, sustain and involve the worlds. Saint Manikkavasakar in *Tirucchadakam* speaks of the Lord as transcending the apprehension of the king of the celestials, the celestial among the celestials and is the lord of the trinity who originates, sustains and destroys the worlds. He also states that He has the lotus feet which cannot be grasped by the trinity who form respectively the beginning, the middle and the end of the worlds. The same author, in his Awakening song, (*Tiruppalli ezhuchi*) refers to the Lord as being, the prime source, the middle and the end. He is beyond the apprehension of the trinity. Saint Ceraman Perumal in his *ula* refers to Lord Siva as being one who protects the world in the form of Vishnu, originates the world in the form of Brahma and destroys the worlds in the form of Rudra. He also refers to Him in his 'andadi' as one whose nature and characteristics are not known to the trinity and all those who belong to the class of individual selves.

Appaiya Diksita, the author of *Siva tattva viveka* in his commentary on the thirteenth verse of the work elaborates this idea with questions and answers and shows that this is the substance of *sruti*, *smṛti*, *purana*, *itihasa* and all such scriptural works. Though this is the case with the trinity, yet Srikanta Rudra is not a *sakala* like Brahma and Visnu, but a perfected self among the *pralaya kalas* and is liberated from bondage and He has all the names, forms and functions of Lord Siva. He is the spiritual master who teaches the Sivagamas. So He is superior to Brahma and Visnu and is the god of worship of those that have entered Saivism receiving the first initiation called *Samaya diksa*.

Thus Meykandar has given the substance of the *sutra* and before taking up the points at issue of the *sutra*, deals with the kind of commentaries in the following observation :

Paraphrase this sutra yourself

Commentary : Paraphrase of the *sutra* may be written by yourself from the interpretation given hereunder by us, dividing the contents of the *sutra* into points at issue.

Paraphrase has been conceived in two ways. One is to give the substance of the aphorism as a whole. The second is to divide the *sutra* into various parts according as it provides points at issue and to show that the parts of the *sutra*, the paraphrase of it and the illustration given therefor conform to a unity of thought. Here the author (Meykandar) has given the injunction at first, so that it may be introduced at the beginning of all the *sutras*.

In as much as the author has given his ruling with regard to the paraphrase, it will be given according to the conclusions arrived at after the dissertations by the author. The *sutra* may be paraphrased as follows :

‘ Because the world consisting of things (male, female and neuter) is subject to the three operations, production, maintenance and dissolution, it is an entity produced by an agent. It comes into being from where it was dissolved because of its impurity. Hence the wise say that it is the agent of dissolution alone that is the prime cause for all the changes in the world.’

As it is necessary that the existence of the transcendent god is to be proved on the basis of the seen universe, the author has affirmed the existence of God by making the universe as the subject of the sentence.

The intention behind that Sanskrit *sutra* which makes God as the subject is the same as that conveyed by the Tamil *sutra*. Here the wise means those who are well versed in epistemology.

The points at issue are : first the universe is subject to three changes, secondly, the world is an entity produced by an agent and it issues forth from the agent of dissolution, and thirdly the agent of dissolution alone is the primal source. Thus this *sutra* issues into three points. These issues are called *adhikaranas*, which term means the locus. Here by locus we mean that it is a division of an aphorism which is the locus for the subject affirmed, the doubt implied, the objections raised by the opponents, the refutations of the opposite views and the establishment of the final truth and the relevance to the unity of thought. Of these the relevance or sequence is of five kinds viz., the sequence of the work, the sequence of the broad division, the sequence of the inner division, the sequence of the aphorism and the sequence of the topic or locus (*adhikarana*). Observe those things

wherever they are dealt with. In the translation the term topic is used to denote *adhikarana*.

First proposition (adhikarana)

The subject of this topic is that the world undergoes three changes. From this follows the main topic that there is an agent for imposing these changes on this universe. The doubt is whether this world undergoes the three changes or not. Here two schools of thought hold the view that the world as a whole is not subject to the three changes. One of them is *Mimamsaka* and the other school is that of the materialists. Both of them will say that to establish the existence of God on the basis of the assumption that the universe undergoes the three changes is like saying that there are horns on the head of the hare because it is born of a cow.

Of the two schools *Mimamsakas* argue thus : we cannot see the three changes of the world. So it is not established by sense perception. As there is no ground which is concomitant with the changes of the world, it cannot be established by means of inference either. It may be said that it can be established by means of verbal testimony as the Vedas affirm the three changes of the universe. But it is only the imperatives like ' Let it be performed ' ' Let it be established ' ' Let it be done ' that are intelligible to those who want to know the meaning of the words used, by observing the deeds done by the knower when asked to perform the deeds by the commander. So the imperatives alone can be held to be a valid means of knowledge. The expressions in the indicative mood cannot generally be held as valid. But if those expressions are helpful for the performance of the imperatives, being related to them some how, those expressions can be taken to be valid by courtesy usage. But even there we cannot establish any relation between the expressions that affirm the three changes of the world and the imperatives found in the *Vedas*. So the Vedas cannot convey that the world has the three changes.

When objection is raised this way, by the *Mimamsakas*, the proposition is given by the author in order to refute the contention. The proposition is formulated from the interpretation of the first part of the *sutra*.

Proposition : Here it is held that the universe known to be an entity and expressed as ' he ', ' she ' and ' it ', has the three changes of origination, development and decay.

‘ Here ’ means in the first topic among the three topics of the *sutra*.

The possible intention of the author in expressing the qualification of the universe as given in the *sutra* itself in the words, ‘ expressed as he, she and it ’, is that because the universe has constituent parts it can be established that it undergoes the three changes. Hence it leads to the syllogistic expression as follows :

The universe has its origin, development and decay ; for, it has constituent parts, as known from the expression that it is indicated by he, she and it, even like a piece of cloth.

It should be noted that the author might have refuted the idea of the opponent that it is only the imperatives in the scriptures that are valid. He might have asserted that conveyance of meaning is not limited to the imperatives alone. Meaning of words is understood by children from the teaching of their parents who point out that the particular word means particular thing. One can also know the meaning of a word from the dictionary. So it is wrong to suppose that as the sentences in the indicative mood are not intelligible they cannot be valid. From this argument the author might have asserted that the verbal testimony itself is the valid means in holding that the universe undergoes the three changes. But the author has condescended to refute the opponent from his own standpoint and has resorted to establishing the truth by inferential reasoning.

In the inferential reasoning the expression constituent part means a part of the whole which can be separated from it, as in the case of a piece of cloth the thread forms part of it. It is a part of it and can be separated individually. It should be noted that the constituent parts of the land, hill and the ocean namely the mud, the piece of stone and water can be separated from the whole by the actions of digging, breaking with the chistle and drawing in a vessel. From the *agamic* expressions that the element *kala* will dispel the effects of the spiritual darkness partly, and manifest the volitional potency of the individual self, that Paramasiva will stir up a part of pure *maya* and create the pure tattvas and that Ananta deva stirs up a part of impure *maya* and create *kala* etc. from this, the things mentioned cannot be considered to be constituent parts simply because the word part is used in describing the respective concepts, for they cannot be separated. In order to exclude such things the constituent part was defined as a

part of the whole which can be separated with the instruments. It must be noted that the constituent part was not simply defined as a part of the whole.

Still, since according to the views of the *Naiyayikas* the atoms have no constituent parts, they cannot be established as being subject to the three changes. Hence it may be argued that the reason of being a constituent part cannot be taken to be universal in its application while establishing the fact of being created. In that case, the intention behind the qualification of the universe of being expressed as 'he', 'she' and 'it', may be interpreted as being insentient and many. According to this interpretation the ground for the three changes of the universe is that it is insentient and many.

The argument runs thus : Saint Manickavacakar has referred to the atoms floating in the bundle of rays of the sun that pierces through some hole of a roof of the house. So atom is to be regarded as the minute particle that is visible to the eye in the bundle of rays of the sun. But the Indian logicians have supposed that what is seen there is the atom of the third order and inferred there from the atom of the first order which is the sixth part of the seen atom. They have named it as *paramanu* and considered it to be invisible and partless. This is arbitrary. Since this conclusion is devoid of any valid means of knowledge, even the atoms of the first order should be considered to have parts. Even if they are taken to be partless, their perishability can be established by means of the ground that they are insentient and many.

It should be noted that though the *anava mala* is insentient it is not many, and though the selves are many, they are not insentient. So there is no question of including both of them in the class of perishable substances. The primordial substance *maya* is insentient and is many inas muchas it is classified into the pure and impure *maya*. So it may be considered to be perishable. If it be argued that each one is not many, there may be the counter argument that even the pots are not many when each individual case is considered. Now the final interpretation of the qualifying phrase is that which is object of our limited knowledge,

Then the proposition reads as follows:—

The universe which is objectified by us as 'he', 'she' and 'it', is subject to the three changes namely origin, development and disso-

lution. The object of using the third personal pronouns 'he', 'she' and 'it' while qualifying the universe is to make this intention explicit. It must be noted, that the author has not chosen to use the words man, woman and a thing (*Oruvan, Oruthi, Onru*) or male, female and neuter while formulating the phrase descriptive of the universe. It may be noted that *Sivajnana Siddhi* says (6.2) 'things objectified by our limited cognition are insentient and perishable. (அறிபொருள் அசித்து அசத்தாம்). The same thing is asserted by *Sivaprakasam* as well in the words, 'know that all things known to our knowledge are perishable (*asat*)'—(*Sivaprakasam-55*)

There are expressions in scriptures which denote eternal verities with the personal pronouns. On that account we should not think that they are the objects of our knowledge. Even though they are conceived in a general way by our knowledge by the use of such expressions they are not experiential objects of our limited knowledge. There are scriptural expressions to this effect. In *Tiruvacakam* it is said of the Supreme that it is the consciousness which is cognised by the cognition which transcends expression and thought (*Koīl Tirupadikam-3*). *Sivajnana Siddhi* commands the aspirant to cognise the Supreme transcending the cognition. (*Siddhi-III.9*). The same work says that the Supreme is to be meditated on by transcendental meditation (*Siddhi VII.6*).

Sambandhar says that the way in which the Supreme showers its grace on the deserving and the majesty of the Supreme if one wishes to listen to are inexpressible, and commands us not to investigate the Supreme too much with reasons and analogies. These scriptural sayings will definitely show that things eternal cannot be objectified by our limited knowledge.

The world can be objectified by our knowledge with respect to its specific properties experientially. It is only to lay stress on this aspect of the question the author, formulating the interpretation of the first part of the *sutra*, has used the phrase as an entity or as a thing existent.

It is to be noted in the sixth *sutra* that eternal verities cannot be objectified. While the *Mimamsakas* are being refuted in this manner, the materialists (*Carvakas*) argue that it is only perception that is the valid means of knowledge and so the truths established by the

inferential reasoning are meaningless. When they say like this, we may refute them by saying that if a man does not adhere to inferential reasoning, there will be no effort on the part of human beings for the sake of future achievement. Even the materialists hold that huge wealth can be accrued only with useful efforts in this life (*Siddhi, Sutra* 2, Stanza 7). So they have to accept inference and from that the verbal testimony as well and they can be refuted in this manner. But still in order to refute the materialist according to his own stand, the following reason is advanced by the author. He asserts that 'the origin and destruction of the universe, are perceptible.' The reason given is 'the origin and the end are seen to accompany the state of sustenance.'

If it is asked how they accompany, the illustrative verse is given as follows :

It should be understood that the substance of the aphorism, the proposition, and the reason of the topic are given in prose, whereas the analogy is given in the form of illustrative verse, which in Tamil is called *venpa* metre.

Illustrative verse :

If we carefully observe the natural world, it will be seen to the wise people that the development of the world depends on its origin and destruction. But it may be said that one thing originates, while another develops, and a third is being destroyed, and we cannot see either the origin of the whole universe or its destruction as a whole. The answer is as follows :

If we carefully look into the changes that occur in nature, a class of things originates during a particular period of time. The same class develops at a particular period of time and it has its end as a whole at another point of time. For example during the rainy season seeds put shoots and in the summer the plant is being harvested. From this a man of wisdom can infer that there is a time for the origin of the whole universe and there will be a time when the whole universe will be resolved into the minute potency from which it has manifested in its gross form.

The universe should be conceived of as having two divisions, the universe of world and the universe of subjects denoted by them.

So far in this topic the three changes of the universe of objects have been established. The interpretation of the same expression may be extended so as to include the world of words as world. The words are conceived as of being masculine, feminine and neuter. They also have their constituent parts and are insentient and many. They are also objectified by our finite cognition. So the origin, development, and destruction of the universe of words can also be established by means of parallel arguments.

It may be questioned whether the perishability of the Vedas will not be contradictory to the universally held view that they are eternal. The Vedas are held to be eternal only because the Supreme Being created the Vedas first at the beginning of the creation and he withdraws them at the end of the aeon. So it is only by courtesy usage that the Vedas are said to be imperishable. This observation equally applies to *Sivagamas* also. The *Vedas* themselves declare that they are the creation of the Supreme Being. The *puranas* expound the meaning of the *Vedas* by saying that the Lord *Paramasiva* who holds in his hands the trident is the author of the eighteen *vidyas*. The eighteen *vidyas* are the four *Vedas*, the six *Angas*, the four *Upangas* and the four *Upavedas*. The four Vedas are *Rig*, *Yajur*, *Sama* and *Atharva*. They are of two parts ; the more important part is wisdom portion (*jnana kanda*) and the other part is the ritual portion which enables one to realize wisdom. The *Sivagamas* are to be included in the wisdom portion of the *Vedas*.

The six *angas* or accessories are *siksha*, *kalpa*, *vyakarana*, *nirukta*, *chandovisidi* and *jyotisa*. *Siksha* is the science of phonetics which gives the rules for pronouncing the Vedic expressions with proper pitches.

The *kalpa* sutras give the rules for the performance of the rituals that are enjoined in the *Vedas*.

Vyakarana is the science of grammar which deals with orthography, etymology etc.

Nirukta is a work giving the various meanings of the words used and may be linked to a dictionary. It explains the diction used in the Vedas.

The *chandovisidi* deals with the prosody of the *Vedas*. They deal with the *chandas* like *Gayatri*, *anustup* etc. *Jyotisa* deals with

auspicious periods of time which are suitable for performing the various rituals. This way these six accessories aid in the learning and performance of the rituals of the Vedas.

The *upangas* are *purana*, *nyaya*, *Mimamsa* and *smṛti*. Of these the *nyaya sastra* deals with epistemology and the logic which should be followed while understanding the expressions of the *Vedas*. The *puranas* expound the meaning of the Vedic diction by giving suitable stories and deal with topics such as the creation of the universe etc.

The *mimamsa* is the science which enables a man to determine the substance of Vedic dicta. They are of two kinds the *Purva Mimamsa* and the *Uttara Mimamsa*. The *Purva Mimamsa* is also called the *Veda* and the *Uttara Mimamsa* is called the *Vedanta*. *Smṛti* is the book which codifies the conduct, atonement, punishment etc., of the people according as they belong to particular caste, and the stage of life which they choose.

Of the four *upavedas*, the medical science is called the *Ayur veda* ; *Dhanur veda* is the military science which enables the king to defend his country making use of offensive weapons. The science of Music is called *Gandharva Veda*. *Artha Veda* is economics.

Second topic

In the first topic the universe which consists of words and objects which they denote is proved to undergo the three changes. This is established in order to establish the existence of the Supreme Being. Here the two schools of thought that are refuted are the *Mimamsaka* and the *Carvaka*. In the second dissertation there are schools such as Buddhism etc., which accept the perishability of the universe but not the existence of God. i.e., they accept the ground and not the conclusion which the *Saiva Siddhantin* strives to establish on that basis. This will clarify the sequence that has been followed between the first and second topics.

The following is the statement of the second topic :

Now, as there is no coming out for a non-entity and there is no activity for an entity without an agent, the Lord of dissolution is the prime source (of the universe).

The term 'Now' is used by Meykandar in order to impress the sequence of the topic. This topic is a mixed one which involves three

involved topics. Of these three, the first one says that the universe is an entity inas much as it evolves. This refutes the school of Buddhism which says as follows :

We need not assume that the universe involves in a particular locus and again evolves from it. If it be an entity it may continue to exist ; but it is only a momentary thing that appears to exist for an instant and soon destroyed yielding place to some thing new. In other words, while a non-entity appears to come out, it is characterised by momentariness. Again when a thing is being destroyed, it leaves its residue behind so that the residue is being caught up by the thing that has a new origin. Thus the continuity of a thing appears. But it is only a momentary thing that appears before us and immediately disappears yielding place to something new. The continuity consists in the residue left behind by the thing destroyed and caught up by the new thing. To cite an example, the shoot originates from the seed, which is destroyed, and the plant originates from the shoot which is destroyed and so on. So this process does not necessitate the existence of an agent ; so says the Buddhist. The first reason given in the original statement, ' as there is no coming out for a non-entity ' refutes this view.

If it be so, the question arises why should an entity evolve. This is answered by the first half of the following illustrative verse. Illustrative verse : (First 2 lines)

' What is involved should evolve from the locus : because of the spiritual dirt. It is the consensus that the involved should evolve in the manner it was involved.'

It should be noted that which is dissolved is reproduced from that into which it was dissolved. This dissolution and the reproduction takes place because of the spiritual impurity of the individual selves. The thing reproduced must be the same thing which originally dissolved in it.

The following questions follow :

If a thing is to be reproduced it might have continued without being dissolved, and if it be necessary for it to be dissolved ; it need not come out again. In order to meet this question, the author has mentioned the spiritual impurity in the illustrative verse. It implies that because the spiritual impurity (the original *mala*) is to be annihilated, creation or reproduction takes place ; and in order that the

individual selves may be given rest after hard work the universe is being dissolved. But it may be further argued that the universe which is being reproduced is altogether a new one ; it need not be the same universe that got dissolved. There is no evidence to show that it is only what was dissolved that is now being reproduced. This objection is met by a counter question : the seed of rice produces only the rice plant, and not the areca plant. Why is this so? Such counter questions which are used to bring the opponent to one's own view i.e., to put the record straight, are called *tarka* in the *Nyaya sastra*. The object of the counter question is to make the opponent feel the untenability of his point of view.

The theory that the effect is implied in its cause (Satkaryavada)

If we do not hold that the effect exists in a subtler form in its cause, the effects such as pots etc., will not arise from their material causes, mud etc. Horn does not appear from the head of a hare. If it be so, it may be asked what the purpose is of the effort used with the instruments in order to produce a thing. The answer is that it is the manifestation of the effect that is the result of such effects even as the presence of water is obtained by digging a well. In the case of the digging of the well we have the impression of the manifestation of water. But in the case of production of a thing our understanding is that the thing is produced or created not discovered or manifested ; so it might be asked.

This objection is answered thus. In the case of a thing which pre-exists in its usual form only by being hidden by other gross things and our efforts are to remove the things obscuring it, our understanding is that the thing is discovered. This is so in the case of water which manifests itself when the well is dug up. But in the case of a pot which exists in a subtle form in the mud, our understanding is that it is being created by means of our effort with the instruments.

It may also be noted that in the case of water of the well, it was prevented from our sight by means of other gross materials such as sand, mud etc. But in the case of the pot it is not visible because it was prevented from our sight by its subtler state of being the cause. Then it is made manifest by means of efforts. In this case it is proper that the impression on our mind should be that of being created or

produced. But it should be noted that in both the cases the effects obtained are not new ones, but the pre-existent ones. This explanation also meets the objection that if the pot pre-exists in the mud, it should be seen, for it is held that the visibility is being prevented by the casual state of the thing. Further objections may be raised as follows :

In the well, the existence of water is known by valid means, but the existence of the pot in the mud is not proved by any valid means. But it is not so. The existence of the pot in the mud can be inferred by means of the following syllogistic reasoning.

The pot exists in the mud even before its coming out ; for it comes out from there.

Whatever is not in a thing cannot come out from it, even as oil cannot be extracted from sand ; nor can the horn make its appearance from the head of the hare.

So it must be held that the pot is being hidden by means of its casual state.

If the pre-existence of a thing created is assumed then it might be objected to by saying that there will be no use in putting forth various kinds of efforts in various cases. This objection cannot be raised because the efforts are put forth in order to make things assume grosser form from subtler ones in which they exist. It may also be noted that since the effect should always have a nexus with the cause, it is absolutely necessary to assume that the cause implies the effect in a subtler form. If the nexus is unnecessary, then all causes may produce all effects, which is not true. This question may be answered by saying that it is only these causes which are potent enough that produce the effects. Then we may argue that even potency should have a nexus with the effect.

The theory of *satkaryavada* is also advanced in *Jnanamṛta* (Vide stanza 23). The following is the free translation of the stanza.

The theory of *satkaryavada* maintains that an effect is involved in its material cause. A piece of cotton is got from cotton threads only, after the process of weaving with the help of weaving machinery. It may be argued : since the cloth is produced only after the use of the instruments the effect is something new which is not to be found in its material cause. But we should know that cloth cannot be got

from mud, and it can be got only from the cotton threads. Every man knows a particular product can be got only from a particular material cause appropriate to it. Even the nature of the product can be inferred from the nature of the thing out of which it is to be produced. Therefore it is concluded that all products are involved in a subtle form in the corresponding material cause. The purpose of the operation of the instruments is only to make the subtle form assume the gross form in which we make use of them. This is established both affirmatively and negatively. When we see the cotton thread, we infer the nature of the cloth which can be made out of it. This is affirmative reasoning. But when we see a lump of clay, we do not think that a cloth can be made out of it. This means that as there is no cloth in the lump of clay, we cannot expect to produce it from the clay. This is the negative form of inference. In order to make the idea vivid, the author cites the exemple of placing new clothing inside a mud pot, whenever it is not used. When the person wants to make use of the clothing, he takes it out of the pot, spreads it and clothes himself with it. So long as the clothing was in the pot, it was invisible. When it is taken out of it, it is visible.*

According to *satkarya vada*, the effect is implied in its material cause. If we say that the effect is not implied in its cause, horns should come out of the hare's head even as the pots are produced from the clay of mud. Then the question arises what the use of the effort with the instrument is if the effect is already there in the cause. One may as well ask if the implied effect can be made use of without the use of instruments and the connected efforts. The answer is that the purpose of the effort and the connected instruments is to make the implied effect manifest and make itself available for practical use. This may be compared to finding water that is already in the subsoil by digging the well.

The water is already there and digging is only to make it manifest and be available for use.

If it be said that the effect is not implied in its cause, we should have all kinds of effects from all kinds of causes without any discrimination. But this is not so.

*Note : It is the old custom to place new clothes not used within a mud pot even as we make use of boxes or almirahs now-a-days.

Hence it should be held that the effect is invisible and is implied in its cause. In the same way, it should be held that *maya* the ultimate cause of the seen universe implies in itself the various evolutes such as *kala* etc.

The same reason refutes the *sunya vadins* who assert that all that appears is only things that which cannot be defined either as real or unreal, and the *Syad vadins* who hold that things which are both real and unreal make their appearance. The *Syad vadins* are also called *anekanta vadins*. Thus the Buddhists and others are refuted by means of the ground that there is no coming out for a non-entity, and the proposition that God of dissolution alone is the prime source is established.

The *Pancaratrins* raise objection as follows. An effect has nexus with its material cause only, and it originates from it and dissolves in it. *Prakṛti* is the ultimate material cause of the universe and it is of the form of Lord Vasudeva. So it should be held that the universe has its origin and dissolution in Vasudeva alone. The Saivaites hold that their Lord is only the efficient cause of the universe and not its material cause. So it is not proper to hold that the Lord of dissolution is the prime source.

This is being refuted by the remaining part of the illustrative verse which has been partially interpreted and used. The remaining part of the illustrative verse is as follows :

If it be said that it is in the agent of preservation that the universe has dissolved, it must be asserted that the whole universe will not dissolve there. The totality of the universe dissolves there where the agents of preservation and production come out after their dissolution i.e., from the Agent of dissolution.

This implies that though you hold the sentient *Vasudeva* as insentient *prakṛti* yet *prakṛti* can involve only those effects that have come out from it and not those effects which transcend it. The answer for the question—what the locus is where the whole of the universe involves is given in the last statement. The answer is ‘It is the locus from which the agencies of preservation and creation come out.’

It should be noted that there are examples in the standard works on Grammar for a single stanza having two main ideas so that it may be split up into two parts to meet two separate cases.

So the first illustrative verse is divided into two parts and the answers for two different questions are got from it.

In the illustrative verse, the term involved is used. It implies that all effects assume their subtle and potential form which is invisible and all pervasive. The potential is the material cause of the universe that is manifested in different forms and shades with different names. It is the intention of the author to include the lord of creation as well along with the lord of preservation among those that evolve from the agency of dissolution. From this it should be understood that even Rudra, the lord of dissolution, who is enumerated as one of the trinity should also be considered to have evolution and involution. The agency from which the whole universe along with the trinity evolves and involves is called Parama Siva. This is mentioned in the *Upanisads* like *Atharvasikha* and others.

The *Atharvasikha* says that it is the Isanah (Lord Siva) that is alone to be meditated upon. Brahma, Visnu, Rudra and Mahesvara, the four lords whose duty it is to create, to preserve, to dissolve and to obscure, are born along with the sense organs and the elements. But the *Isana* is the ultimate source. He is the giver of the other sources and is the careator of the whole universe with His will power. So He cannot be born. He should be meditated upon as being seated in the midst of pure ether. He is the real ruler and controller of all things—*Atharvasikha*.

Brahma and others are respectively the lords of the evolutes and the worlds included in the five *kalas* which are named *nivrtti*, *prathistha*, *vidya*, *santi* and *santiyatita*. Of these Visnu is the lord of the *pratista kala*. So He is the presiding deity of the *prakrti* maya and on that account by courtesy usage *prakrti* maya is identified with Vasudeva and all its effects are considered to be of the form of Vasudeva. On that account we cannot say with validity that Vasudeva who is sentient is the same as the insentient *prakrti*. Even supposing that Vasudeva is identical with *prakrti*, it cannot be maintained that all things of the universe will be involved in *prakrti*. If the lord of preservation dissolves everything in the universe, the implied distinction in the nomenclature the lord of creation, the lord of preservation and the lord of dissolution will be wiped out. If the lord of dissolution dissolves, it cannot be said that he will dissolve only certain thing, leaving out other beings. So the lord of dissolution should dissolve

the whole of the universe and when the universe is to be reproduced it should come out from Him alone. Also the *upansisd* speak of the trinity as *Jagramurti*, *svapna murti* and *susupti murti* (the lords presiding over the three states of wakefulness, dream and sleep) and describe Lord Siva as *turiya murti* (a fourth state) i.e., the lord transcending the above three states. The same transcendence is not attributed to any one of the trinity. Hence the lord of dissolution alone is the prime lord and He is the prime source of the whole creation. The question that the lord of dissolution is held to be the efficient cause and not the material cause may give room for raising a point of objection. But that the efficient cause is the main support of *maya*, the material cause of the universe, will be established in the illustrative verse which begins with the words. ‘ *vittu unda* ’, (seed being existent).

Haradatta has established the supremacy of the lord of dissolution who is named *Pasupati* (the lord of the individual selves) by giving twenty two reasons in five Sanskrit slokas. It is translated by Sivajnana Munivar in the *asiriya* metre. A free translation of it is given here :

Lord Siva is the object of praise of the *Gayatri mantra* which is considered to be the essence of the Vedas ; (1) Raghurama has installed *Sivalinga*, the symbol of the Lord, in Ramesvaram and worshipped Him. (2) Lord Krishna went to Sri Kailas and got a boon from Lord Siva to beget a child (3) Lord Visnu has performed worship with lotus flowers which numbered one thousand and eight along with his eye ; Lord Siva was pleased with him and granted him the disc. (4) Lord Siva opened his eye of the brow and caused Cupid to be reduced to ashes. (5) Siva drank the poisonous portion and enabled all living beings including the *devas* to survive. (6) He caused the death of *Yama*, the deity of death by lifting his left toe against him. (7) He also destroyed the three wandering cities of the *asuras*. (8) He caused the destruction of the sacrifice of *Daksa* and then bestowed on him His grace. (9) Lord Siva granted His weapon called *Pasupata* to *Dananjaya*, the hero of Mahabharata. (10) He has assumed the shape of a beastly bird called *Sarabha* and controlled the violence of *Narasimha*. (11) When Visnu took the shape of the damsel called Mohini it was Lord Siva that enjoyed her and brought forth the Lord Satta (Aiyappan). (12) It is Lord Siva that is being worshipped by great men at various sacred places in the world. They were rewarded with wealth which is counted as eight in number. (13) Lord Visnu performed Siva

worship in all His incarnations. (14) Siva assumed the shape of huge pillar of fire of which the bottom and the top could not be reached by the deities of creation and preservation. (15) Lord Siva is free from characteristics of the individual selves such as birth and death. (16) In the sacred city of Varanasi which is watered by the holy Ganges, Vyasa uttered a lie and thereby his hands were caused to be immovable.

(17) At the time of the destruction of the three wandering cities it was Lord Visnu who became an ox and bore Lord Siva as a vehicle. (18) Lord Siva wears the garland of the heads of the deities of creation countless in number. (19) It is Lord Siva that grants spiritual wisdom and consequent freedom from birth to the sincere devotees who worship Him. For these reasons, those who are well-versed in scriptural works, conclude that it is Lord Siva that is the Supreme Being. The *Pancaratrins* have attempted to refute these reasons in their own way, but it should be concluded that they lack credible scriptural evidence.

The *pancaratrins* also say that the *Sivapuranas* are delusive in character and hence wherever they contradict with the *sattvika* and *rajasa puranas*, they become inadmissible. They also say that a day in the creator's life is called a *kalpa* and he will be under the influence of one of these three qualities or their collective effect on these four *kalpas* respectively and whenever he is overcome by a particular quality he will expound the *purana* of the deity of that particular quality and from this it will be clear that the *Sivapuranas* are only *tamasic* (delusive) in character and that this is expressed in the *Maccha purana*. These statements should be refuted as being those of men who have no discretion. The *Maccha purana* does not say that the deity of creation will be under the influence of the respective qualities in the respective *kalpas*. It says that in a particular *kalpa* a particular quality will predominate ; from this we cannot read the meaning that the deity of creation himself will be influenced or dominated by that quality. In the seasonal changes, each season is predominated by rain or sun's heat or winter, and so those seasons are named accordingly as the rainy season, summer season and winter season. In those seasons particular things, birds etc. will be predominant and in the epics, the poets describe such seasons as being dominated by such things. Similarly during the days of the creator one day will be dominated by *Sattvika*, another by *rajasa*, a third by *tamasa* and the fourth by a mixture of these three qualities. Since each day is dominated by a

particular quality, it is natural that those qualities and the things characterised by them are extolled during that time.

If it be said so, the question arises as to what the purpose of dividing those days in that manner is in the said *purana*. The answer is as follows : The *puranas* disagree in details, because each day is predominated by a particular quality and so the deity of that particular quality is being praised during that *kalpa*. Hence it is that all the contents of the *puranas* are to be considered valid accordingly. This is the purpose of making the said division.

Now it may be asked that even though the deity of creation, cannot be held to possess the quality of *tamasa* because of the division mentioned in *Maccha purana*, it may be held that because he praises Rudra who is admittedly of the quality of *tamasa* the narrator himself should be considered to be influenced by and possess the quality of *tamasa*. That is not correct. If we hold that idea, then Vyasa who describes the qualities and actions of demons who are admittedly of *tamasa* qualities should be considered to possess that quality. But it is not so. Even this is with regard to the *trinity* who are admittedly of the three qualities. But Parama Siva transcends all these qualities and His fame is manifest with equal splendour during all the various *kalpas* and there can be no doubt about His being free from the three qualities. Now, even Rudra should be considered to take up the quality of *tamasa* in order to perform the action of dissolution, for He does not possess, sleep, confusion, partiality etc., which are the effects of the quality of *tamasa*. Lord Visnu is assigned the quality of *sattvika* only with respect to his special function of preservation. Such questions of polemics are being discussed in the Sanskrit work which is called *Brahma tarka stavam*. So the reader is referred to that work. From this it should be understood that the division namely *Vaisnava*, *Naradiya*, *Garuda*, *Bhagavata*, *Padma* and *Varaka* are *puranas* of *sattvik* character ; *Brahma*, *Brahmanda*, *Brahmakai-vartha*, *Markandeya*, *Paudika* and *Vamana* are of *rajasic* character ; *Ilinga*, *Saiva*, *Agneya*, *Skandha*, *Kurma* and *Maccha* are *tamasic* in character, is not admissible. Also all the *puranas* are revealed by Lord Siva and the deity of creation learns those things from Lord Siva and expounds them. So there is no valid scriptural evidence to show that the *puranas* relating to each of the *trinity* is related only in the *kalpa* which is predominated by the corresponding quality. So it is not proper to say that the *puranas* are characterised by the said

qualities simply because they are respectively expounded during the *kalpas* when the respective qualities predominate. But it may be said simply because these *puranas* describe the trinity whose qualities are established as above, it is correct to make such a division among the *puranas*. But thereby Lord Siva does not suffer in the least. He transcends all the three qualities and it is mentioned in the *Vedas*, *Sivagamas*, *Puranas* and *Itihasas* that He is *gunatita*. Also among *Garuda purana*, *Siva rahasya* and *Sivagita* of the *Padma purana* which are held to be of the quality of *sattvik*, the greatness of Siva is elaborated even more distinctly than in *Linga purana* etc. So their purpose is not served even by such a division of the *puranas*.

Now if we really look into the matter factually it should be noted that the *Sivapuranas* are only the clear and explicit exposition of what is said in the *Vedas*. So they should be considered to be superbly valid. Other *puranas* do not expound the Vedic assertions. So when they contradict *Sivapuranas* they should be interpreted so as to suit the context by means of inferential evidence. In the *puranas* at certain places Rudra is depicted as being inferior to the deity of preservation and the deity of creation. This is because when those deities were unable to perform their allotted functions, *Nilalokita* and similar personal gods came out of their personages in order to teach them the forgotten functions. These deities are supposed to be the sons of the deities by courtesy and they are spoken of as being inferior to them. This is to be inferred from the nature of the scriptures. Even in the epic of *Bharata* this kind of interpretation should be given in those places where the deity of dissolution is spoken of as being inferior to the other two deities, for it is well known that *Mahabharata* depicts the greatness of Lord Siva. This may be known by a study of *Bharata tatparya sangraha*.

In the Tamil *Divyaprabhanda* it is said that Narayana created Brahma and Brahma in his turn created Rudra. There is also a statement in what is called *Narayana upanisad* that from Narayana was born Rudra and from Narayana was born Brahma. These statements are contradictory, if both of them refer to the same persons and on the same occasions. Rudra and Brahma cannot be the persons indicated in both the scriptures and consequently we have to conceive of several Rudras and Brahmas as against one Supreme Rudra, who is the overlord of the trinity. In the *upanisads* like *Atharvasikha* it is said that the trinity were created by the Supreme Being. But the

puranas speak of the deities belonging to the trinity creating the two deities other than they themselves. So it should be inferred that the Supreme Being transcends the trinity and create them. In *Siva tattvaviveka* it is said that the Supreme Being created Brahma in one *kalpa*, Hari in another *kalpa*, Rudra in a third *kalpa*, and all the three together in a fourth *kalpa* and ordains the first created one to create the other two subsequently. The meaning of this may be elaborated and understood.

In *Mahabharata* the statement occurs that ‘Visnu is the self of Rudra who is of great splendour.’ Here the word *self* (atma) cannot mean *antaryami*, the self of the self, for such an interpretation will go against the epithet, *great splendour*, used to describe Rudra. So it should be understood in the sense that both of them are not different or the word *Atma* should be taken to mean body. In *Moksadharma* of the same epic, Lord Krishna says, ‘I worship with great love Lord Rudra who is my *self*. Here the word *self* means only the self of the self, *antaryami*, for worship is to be performed only to the self of the self. Thus all the scriptures are identical in pointing to the Supremacy of Lord Siva.

In the ritual portions of the Veda it is said that *Visnu* is *parama* and *Agni* is *avama* and all the rest of the deities are in between them. Here the words *parama* and *avama* mean the first and the last respectively. In a particular sacrifice it is said that Visnu should receive his oblation first and *agni* should come last to receive his oblation and the other deities come in between them. Here it is not proper to ascribe the meaning supreme to the word *Parama* and inferior to *avama*; for it will be contradictory to the sayings in the Vedas, *smrtis* and *puranas* that *Agni* is the great among the gods. So it is necessary that the real meaning of the words should be determined so as to suit the context in which they are used.

The following argument is advanced by the *Pancaratrins* to establish the supremacy of *Visnu*. The identification of a king among those that march in a procession cannot be made with respect to the clothing, ornaments or vehicles such as elephants and horses that are used by them, for these are common even to the commanders or the ministers. Also when the king is pleased he may grant even richer than his own possessions. In the same manner the Supreme among the gods referred to in the *Vedas* cannot be determined by means of

expressions that speak highly of them or of their possessions. But a king can be pointed out by means of his crown and the umbrella under which he proceeds. So also the Supreme among the Vedic gods should be determined only by means of expressions which indicate the casual relation of godhead with the universe and it is demonstrated in the *upanisads* like *Supala* that god Narayana is alone the cause of the creation of the universe. It may be questioned that since the cause of the universe is also referred to by general expressions such as *sat*, *Brahman* and *Atma* and by special expressions such as *Hiranyagarbha*, *Siva* and *Rudra*, doubts may arise in the determination of the primal Being. But it should be noted that Lord Narayana is stated to be the case in *Supala* and not others while the creation of the universe is being dealt with. So the real import of the *Vedanta* should be taken that Lord *Narayana* is the real cause of the universe. The common terms such as *Sat*, *Brahman* and *Atma* will refer to Lord Narayana alone even as the term *pasu* refers to *sakha pasu* in the Vedic sacrifices. (Sakha means goat).

The proper names such as *Hiranyagarbha* etc. will refer to Lord Narayana by derivation. Even if proper names prohibit derivation they may be considered to refer to Lord Narayana by the usage substitution of one name for a related one. It may also be noted that all the names of Siva are found in the list of the thousand names of Lord Narayana. So those names referring to casual relation may be taken to denote only *Narayana*. But reversing the relation it may be argued that the names of Lord Narayana may be taken to indicate Siva and Siva may be taken to be the Supreme. But it is inadmissible, for all other names of Lord Visnu may be derived so as to denote Siva whereas the name Narayana cannot be derived so. Grammar by Panini says as follows : The word is derived from the terms *naram* and *ayanam* ; *naram* means water and *ayanam* means the place. Narayana means God who resides in water. In the derivation, the Grammar of Panini says that the letter Na in the succeeding word will be changed Na (न) in the presence of r in the preceding word if the name is a proper one. To retain the present form the name has to retain its characteristic of being proper. So Narayana can never be taken to mean Siva. It is because of this, *Supala* and other *upanisads* use the term *Narayana* while referring to the Prime Being. If other words like *Siva* are used they can be treated as derived words and may refer to any God. This is the arguments of the *Pancaratrins*. But we have

to observe that these are the sayings of people who have not read and understood the import of the *upanisads* like the *Svetasvatara*.

It is correct to say that the Supreme should be determined with respect to the scriptural assertion regarding the chief cause of the universe. It is because of that we have come to the conclusion that Lord Paramasiva is the Supreme Being. The *upanisads* like *Supala* purport to delineate the origination and the dissolution of the universe. It is not their intention to indicate or point out the Supreme Being who is the primal source of the universe. It is only casually they refer to the cause of the universe just to show that the activities imply a cause. But the *upanisad Svetasvatara* begins with the interrogation of the *rsis*. What is the Brahman, the cause of the universe etc. ? The intention behind the interrogation is to know exactly what is intended in expression like the cause of the world in the *upanisads Svetasvatara* introducing itself with the above questions begins to answer the questions by referring to the Lord Siva through out the *upanisad*, using only the terms that would refer to *Parama Siva*. So it is clear that *Svetasvatara* is more authoritative than the other *upanisads* in determining the primal one and it should be concluded that Lord Siva who is referred to by that *Upanisad* alone should be taken as the Primal Being. The other names that are found in other *upanisads* referring to the cause of the universe should be taken to mean Siva alone by the principle of similarity as illustrated by *Sakha Pasu*. Even the proper names like *Hiranyagarbha* and *Narayana* can be derived from their constituent parts so as to refer to Lord Siva or they may be taken by the use of the figure of substitution to refer to Lord Siva. In the Vedas it is accepted that all the names refer to Lord Paramasiva alone. It should be noted that it is only by the realization of the fact that the term *Narayana* is a proper name, it is taken to mean Lord Paramasiva by substitution and not by derivation.

In the expression, the village of sheperds on the Ganges, the village is taken to be the village on the banks of the Ganges. This is because the word Ganges properly refers to the flowing waters alone ; So we resort to the usage of substitution of the word Ganges for its banks. If the word refers to the banks also by its natural usage, we need not say that it refers to the banks by substitution. Hence it should be noted that even by citing grammar rules to show that the term *Narayana* can be treated as a proper name alone, the desire of the opponent is not fulfilled.

Now we shall show how the term *Narayana* by its constituent part will refer to Lord Siva alone by treating it as a derived name. The term *Naram* will mean the collection of men or living beings. The collection of *Narar* is *Naram*. It is from *Narar* by the addition of suffix *am* showing collection. The word *Naram* again takes the suffix 'Ya' and becomes *naray*. The meaning of the suffix is movement. Again *Naray* itself acts as one particle and the suffix 'u' which is changed into *ana* is added ; the word now, becomes *Narayana*, the addition of the suffix *u* is to indicate agency or the subject of the action. By the grammatical rule that 'Na' in the name derived from the action becomes changed into *Na* (ना) the word becomes *Narayanah*. So the term means one who is inseparable from the collection of the individual selves. It should also be noted that the term *Narayanah* has for its suffix 'U' only ; it is only because of this the feminine gender of the word ends in *i*, as it is always *Narayani*. It should be noted that unless it is held that the word ends in *U* there is no grammatical rule for conjugating it as *Narayani* in the feminine gender. A similar refutation may be adopted in the case where the opponents hold *Hiranyagarbha* as the Primal Being.

So far the Buddhists and the *Pancaratrins* have been refuted, and the existence of the primal Being is established. The reason for the refutation of the Buddhists is explicitly given in the original proposition in the words ' Now as there is no coming out for a nonentity ' and the reason for refutation of the *Pancaratrins* is implied in the words, ' the Lord of dissolution ', where the universe dissolves !

The *Sankhyas* will admit that the universe is an entity, but they will not admit the existence of a Supreme Being for its cause. In order to refute them the clause ' as there is no activity for an entity without an agent ' is used. The implication is that there is no creation without the Lord of dissolution, even as a pot which is in a subtle form in the clay has to be evolved only with the action of a potter.

Here the main question is that the reason that there is no activity for an entity without an agent will only establish the doer in a general way. It cannot establish that the Lord of dissolution alone is the doer. But it may be argued that as the universe dissolves in the Lord of dissolution, He should be the primal source. Even then it is clear that the Lord of dissolution is only an efficient cause and it is well known that the universe will involve in its material cause which is

maya. So it is untenable to call the Lord of dissolution as the primal source.

Also the universe consists of various classes of living beings like birds, cows and human beings and even among human beings some people are rich and others are poor. So even if it be admitted that this universe has got a Lord, He should be partial with desire and aversion. So He should be one among ourselves. But it may be argued that the creation takes various forms according to the law of *karma*. In that case a person who depends upon the *karma* of living beings, and is not independent, cannot be taken to be the agent. Also *karma* alone may be taken to be the cause and not the Lord. It may be argued that as *karma* and *maya* are insentient it is necessary that there should be a Lord who is sentient for the manipulation of the creation. But the milk of the mothercow flows by itself and brings up the calf, and the insentient magnet attracts iron filings. So it is not proper to say that there is no action on the part of insentient things. Also since the potter who produces the pot is subject to the limitations of ignorance and *karma* and has embodiment, the Lord who is inferred on the basis of this analogy should also be limited like the potter and should undergo change and be affected by his actions.

In the case of inference of the potter, we saw the potter and the pot simultaneously at one place, and when we see only the pot at another place, it is proper that the existence of a potter be inferred. But in the case of the primal Being, we have not seen the universe and its efficient cause simultaneously. So there will be no grasp of concomitant relation between the universe and its creator. Hence there is not the possibility of having inferential knowledge itself. For all these reasons it is not possible to establish the existence of a prime one, on the basis that entities have their movement from an efficient cause. When objection is raised in the above manner, the following illustrative verse is given in order to strengthen the ground used, refuting the objections raised. These objections are anticipated ones.

The following is the illustrative verse.

2 (b) As the earth becomes moistened and as there is seed in it, the seed puts forth its shoot and evolves into a plant according to its potential. So also *maya*, the seed of the universe, depends on its support, the Lord's grace, and by His will power it evolves into the universe in accordance with the *karma* of the individual selves. The

conferring of the embodiment and the environment to the various individual selves according to their deserts may be compared to the providing of the environment, food and other things by the mother wasp to its young one which is of the form of a worm at first and enabling it to grow into a wasp by successive stages of evolution.

On this account one cannot say that the Lord is not independent since He provides things according to the *karma* of the individual selves. *Karma* is simply an indicator of the spiritual development of the self. Thereby the Supreme self does not lose His independence.

The Lotus plant which is called *pankaja*, has its origin in the root of the plant. But the word *pankaja* means that which has its origin in the watery mud. This is because watery mud is the main support of the root of the plant. In the same manner scriptures say that the universe has its origin in the Lord of dissolution since He is the support and locus of the *maya*. In other words the universe which has its origin in *maya* is said to have its origin in the Lord of dissolution by courtesy usage, since the Lord of dissolution is the mainstay of *maya* even as the watery mud is the mainstay of the root of the lotus and causes it to put forth the plant. Since it is said that the universe has its origin in the Supreme Being, *Sivadvaitins* will say that the Supreme being is the material cause of the universe in conjunction with the *maya*. That it is only a difference in the formulation, will be explained in the second topic of the second *sutra*. The fact that what is *maya* is supported and the Supreme Being is the support should be understood from their being the pervaded and the pervading ones respectively. Although the three entities the Lord, the self and the *maya* are said to be the pervading ones, they are respectively the subtle and gross ones like water and oil. So they are to be considered as the pervading and the pervaded ones. That the three entities are respectively the pervading and the pervaded ones will also be shown in the second *adhyakaraṇa* of the second *sutra*. As the shoot or sprout can only sprout from the seed and not from the bare earth which is the main support of the seed so the universe cannot have its origin simply from the Supreme Being without the existence of *maya*. So the *Parinama vadins* who speak of the transformation of the Supreme Being into the universe and the *maya vadins* who speak of the illusory appearance or transfiguration of the Supreme Being into the universe are refuted.

In the first illustrative verse the author used the term involved (*ilayittatadu*). From the term it may be inferred that the whole universe will be involved in the subtlest form which is invisible and all pervasive, so that the visible and the finite universe may evolve from the state. That invisible state into which the whole universe is reduced and from which the same universe is evolved is denoted by the term *maya* in the Saiva scriptures. The word *maya* is also a term used in *Svetasvatara upanishad*. Hence the existence of the *maya*, the material cause of the universe should be considered to have been established in the first illustrative verse. It is referred to in the second illustrative verse from the figure used of the seed.

The existence of *karma* will be dealt with in the second topic of the second aphorism. There it will also be seen that the existence of *karma* does not preclude the independence of the Lord. Answers to further objections that have been raised at the beginning of the illustrative verse 2 are given from the implication.

It may be said that *karma* alone will be sufficient for the reproduction of the world and the positing of the existence of God is not necessary. This is answered by the saying that as *karma* is insentient the existence of God is a necessary condition.

Since milk will not come from the udder of a dead cow and since the iron nail should be brought into the magnetic field so that it may be attracted by the magnet the necessity of the presence of a sentient being will be felt in both the cases. It may be argued that since the selves are sentient they are enough for the functioning of the deeds without the presence of a Supreme Being. But it is not so, because the selves are bound by the spiritual dirt which is known by the name of *anava* and so they require the presence of a sentient being for their activities even as a jar of mud.

Again it may be said that the unbound souls will perform the function of the Supreme Being. Here it may be asked whether the unbound self is originally unbound or unbound later on at a particular point of time. If the reply is that it was originally unbound, then it is the same thing as we hold. The Supreme Being is beginninglessly unbound. If instead it is said that it is the self or selves unbound at some point of time later, then it may be asked who had helped them to become released and it should be admitted that the beginninglessly

unbound one must have helped them to remove their bondage. This topic has been discussed in *Jnanamrtam* also, vide 56th verse.

The illustrative verse 2 ends with the question whether the Lord will not provide the embodiment and the environment for the bound self even as the mother wasp does to her young ones. From this question which requires to be elaborated so as to fulfil the implication of the author these questions and answers have been given.

The following illustrative verse answers the objections that may be raised as follows. *Objection*: The potter is enshrouded by ignorance and is not free to act and will be affected by changes. So the Supreme Being which is established on his analogy should also possess such imperfections. *Answer*: There are two kinds of agents. One is he who functions with the requisite instrumentalities. Another kind is the agent who can function with will power, in the second case there is no limitation or change due to activity. God produces the world with His will power without requiring any instrumentalities. He protects and destroys the whole universe on similar lines. So He is as independent and free as a man who remembers his experiences in a dream during his wakeful state. Time is the instrumental cause for a number of changes in the universe. But it remains unaffected by the changes produced by it. The term *with the mind* or *as the mind* (*ulattil*) may be taken to give two kinds of imports. One is that it simply means *by the will power*. The other is as follows:

A man who masters a particular art or science, of course, undergoes certain changes and sufferings at first. But after the mastery, the meaning and the expression that conveys the meaning come from his mind freely without affecting him in the least. So also God involves the whole universe with His will power and the evolution of the universe takes place as freely as the delivery of a lecture on the subject mastered by a person. The intention behind the illustrative verse is that though there are two kinds of agents, yet the analogy of the potter is cited because of the common element of the agency or being the efficient cause.

Again it may be insisted that the agent who imposes the three kinds of changes should possess an embodiment and so should possess a form. But it is not so, for the self that moves and controls its own

body which has a form has no form for itself. So also the Supreme Being while remaining formless could act on the universe which is His form. In order to impress this idea on the disciple the author of the secondary work, *Sivajnana Siddhi* has spoken about the subtlest functions of the Lord in the following words.

The individual self while acting on its physical body has its mind to display the will, cognition and desire and is able to grasp the impressions of the external world through the sense organs. In the same manner the whole universe is the embodiment of the Supreme Being. The living beings are the parts of the body where the sense organs are situated. The inner instruments for the Lord are the three fold potency which manifest in the form of conation, cognition and volition. The individual selves are the sense organs which are activated by the dance of five functions by inducing consciousness to the individual self which does good to them. If we admit embodiment to the Lord, then on that similarity we should admit the existence of another Lord, who has to create the embodiment of the Lord. This will lead to infinite regress.

Also since the embodiment is an impediment which will prevent the freedom of action of the agent, first of all we suppose that the formless God with His Consciousness-Force creates *Nada* etc., from pure *maya*. Then by His own free will He embodies Himself with *nada* etc., and functions. This idea is expressed in the 53rd stanza of *Jnanamṛtam*.

We may recall an objection raised earlier. If a man has seen God and His creation at a particular place first and then if he sees only His creation then it will be proper that he will infer the existence of God by the strength of the concomitance. So far as God is concerned, He was never seen as in the case of a potter. So there is no possibility of the occurrence of inferential reasoning itself.

Now we shall question the opponents. A man who has seen both the smoke and the fire in a hearth if he happens to see the smoke alone in another hearth, it is proper that he should infer the existence of fire though it is not visible. But in the case of a mountain smoke alone is seen by the person and not the fire. Do you admit that he will be able to infer the existence of fire in the mountain also by using the analogy of the hearth, even though smoke on the mountain is

comparatively large. If you say that since there is difference in the volumes of smoke in the hearth and that on the mountain, there can be no inferential knowledge, then I should say that you are not a believer in the efficacy of inference. If, on the other hand, you say that there will be inferential knowledge in the case of mountain as well on the strength of the universality of interdependence of the substances smoke and fire, the same thing will equally apply to the existence of God. A man who sees the object as well as the doer at a certain place, invariably, grasps the concomitance of them. So as he sees the object alone, which is the universe it is but proper that he should infer the presence of the creator of the universe who is the agent. This argument is used in verse 50 of *Jnanamrtam* also. Such arguments may be found and read with advantage in Sanskrit *Sivagamas*.

Third topic

In the second topic the Buddhists who say that the universe will by itself appear and disappear, and the *Pancaratrins* and others who admit the existence of an efficient cause but deny that it is the Lord of dissolution, are refuted and it was established that the Lord of dissolution is the primal source. The third topic establishes that because of that the Lord of dissolution alone is the primal source.

Now the objection and the response may arise as follows :

Objection : Any proposition to be useful should contain additional information. The proposition in the second topic is : ' There is no coming out from any Being other than the locus of dissolution '. Now to make it the topic for another topic is not of any use, in as much as it does not import any new content.

Response : Propositions are of three kinds, viz. proposition that imports new content, proposition that defines the 'manner of carrying out the injunction and proposition that negates the occurrence where necessary.

The following are the illustrations. ' Worship of Siva is to be done ' is an imperative of the first kind, for, without this injunction worship of Siva will not be obtained by any other injunction. The injunction, ' worship Siva by assuming sitting posture alone ' belongs to the second kind ; by the general injunction the assumption of the sitting posture might be obtained. But in case one decides to perform

the worship by assuming any other posture, the sitting posture will fail to be obtained. So the special injunction defining the manner of performance is necessary and is positively protective in nature. The proposition that 'The term Siva is appropriate to Siva alone is an injunction which denies the application of the term to any other deity, who may be called Siva as per the common meaning 'auspicious' for the word Siva.

In the two cases where worship of Siva is to be performed in the sitting posture alone, and the term Siva is to be applied to Siva alone, the modification made by the use of *alone* is only the denial of any other posture, and of using the term to any other deity. Hence it may be said that there is no difference in the two cases. But it should be noted that there is difference in the senses of the two expressions. In the first case, before prohibiting any other posture we have to affirm that worship of Siva should be performed by assuming the sitting posture. So the affirmation of the sitting posture is the main object of the injunction and the prohibition of any other posture follows it. Also the modification introduced by the word 'alone' is enriching the meaning of the expression at first, and then the restriction in the performance follows. But in the other case where we say that the term Siva is to be used only to Him, restriction alone is the purpose. There it is not necessary to affirm that the term Siva may be used to Siva also. Hence the difference between the two injunctions will be noticed. The three injunctions or imperatives are respectively called in Sanskrit *apurva vidhi*, *niyama vidhi* and *parisankhya vidhi*. In English we may use the term declarative, directive and preventive or restrictive to them respectively.

Here the proposition of this topic is 'Now the Lord of dissolution alone is the primal source.' Here it may be questioned how this proposition is preventive. In the second topic it was established that the whole universe has its origin only in the lord of dissolution. From that it follows that the Lord of dissolution is the efficient cause. Here it may occur to a person that even in the case of the construction of a chariot, a number of people have to work at it. This universe is something too complex and great to be constructed by a single person. Also in the Vedas deities like Visnu, Agni (Fire) and others are spoken of as being the efficient cause of the Universe. Also it is said that Narayana, Hiranyagarbha, Indra, the Sun and the Fire etc. are spoken of as being the primal source of the universe by the

Vedas. By perception also we see the potter and others to be the creators of pot etc., so it is not proper to say that the Lord of dissolution alone is the efficient cause of the universe. Now it may be argued that even the actions performed by the potter and others also are the actions done by the Supreme Being, so it is not wrong to see others also performing the act of creation. But in that case to cite the potter as the illustration in the syllogistic expression that is used to establish the existence of God is not proper. For the same thing cannot be used as both conclusion and illustration. Also in the *Sivagamas* it is said that to become equal to Siva is the state of release. So it should be accepted that all the released selves, become equal to the Supreme Being and they too perform cosmic functions. So there is no use in establishing the Supreme Being as the lord of dissolution alone. In this manner it may be objected to when the proposition is formulated. The purpose of the topic is to deny that all others except the Lord of dissolution are entitled to be called the primal cause. The implication of the word 'Now' used by Meykandar in the proposition is to elaborate the meaning of the relevance of the proposition this way.

The force of 'alone' is to prevent the inclusion of other deities as the primal cause. The ground for the proposition is given as follows. 'Earthly beings which have finite cognition are dependent on the Lord of dissolution who has no finite cognition.'

The dependence of the living beings of the universe is established by the qualifying phrase 'of finite cognition' and the independence of the Lord of dissolution is implied by the qualification, 'not conditioned by the finite cognition.' Here the universe means the sentient beings alone. It is only they that have to be denied the agency. It will be made clear in the latter part of the work how the selves are conditioned by finite cognition and how the Lord of dissolution is not conditioned by finite cognition.

Even though the chariot and such other things are being constructed by a number of persons yet all of them will have to be directed by a single agency. Otherwise the execution of the work will not be complete as desired. In order to establish the unseen God, the known agency of the potter is used as illustration in the inferential reasoning first. After establishing the existence of God with the first inference we establish that even the actions performed by the potter and others are directed by the will of God, for even the potter and others are chained by ignorance and have finite cognition. So the Lord who is

not chained by ignorance and finite cognition should be the prime Agent, even for the actions performed by other agents. So it is established that the Lord of dissolution is the agent active and causative, both direct and indirect.

Even in the Vedas the mention of other deities such as Narayana and Hiranyagarbha as the source of the universe is because they happen to be the intermediary agents in a secondary sense even as the potter and others. This truth is expressed in III chapter of the *Svetasvatara upanisad*, especially the second *mantra* of the chapter, which reads as follows : Rudra ‘(Who protects and controls the worlds by His own powers) is indeed one only ; there is no one besides Him, who can make Him the second. O men, He is present inside. After creating and maintaining all the worlds, He finally at the appointed time withdraws them unto Himself.’

Even if it be so the following objection may be raised. Even as the finite beings are many, the infinite Lords of dissolution may be assumed to be many, for there is no valid means of knowing there is only one agent of dissolution. Also it is well known that in the state of release the individual selves become equal to Lord Siva. So those individual selves when they become free from ignorance, will remain without finite cognition and they will also become the agents of the creation of the world. In order to refute this objection the following illustrative verse is given by Meykandar.

Illustrative verse No. 5

The universe has its origin from the will of God who is neither the one nor the other of the two kinds of the universe which are subtle and gross. Similarly it has its sustenance and its dissolution by His will. So the Lord of dissolution alone is the primal agent. Even in the state of release the released selves are dependent on the Supreme Being in a number of ways.

The expanded meaning of this verse is as follows : The universe, of the form of effect is insentient and sentient. The sentient are chained by ignorance and act with finite cognition. So in order to activate these two worlds a prime agent who is not of the universe is obtained. Also as the universe is infinite and varied in its manifestation, the primal agent should have the divine qualities of omniscience, omnipotence, abundant grace etc., such an agent should be conceived as one alone. To assume such a Godhead to be many will transgress the principle of parsimony. There is also a principle in

Philosophy that if there be no difference in defining quality it is not proper to assume as many the thing defined. According to this principle Saint Meykandar has used the telling expression that the Supreme is the *one* which is not of the universe. The term *one* means, that it is not many in terms of its defining qualities. In the hymn which is known as *Tiruppasuram*, Saint Tirujnana Sambandhar sings of God saying 'our father defies classification' (Endaiyar avar evvakai-yar kolo). The significance of this saying is the same as the term used by Meykandar.

Here the universe indicated is the sentient ones i.e., the individual selves. Even though they are eternal, and have no origin and end, yet inas muchas they appear with embodiment and cast it off it is proper to speak of them as having birth and death or in other words origin and end. 'The Lord of dissolution alone is the primal source' is the final conclusive statement.

The dependence of the released selves even in the state of release should be known from the following scriptural utterings. 1. *Siva-jnana Siddhi sutra* 11, stanza 11. If we say that since both the individual selves and the Supreme self are one inas muchas they are both sentient, the following distinctions should be noticed. Lord Siva is the intelligence which bestows grace, the individual self is the one who receives the grace, Lord Siva is the agent of giving birth and death and experience of the world as well as of Himself. The individual self experiences all those things. The individual self is enabled to know whereas Siva is the independent knower. So even in the state of release they cannot become identical, but they will remain inseparable. Comparatively we may take the individual self as being intelligent even as the intellect. The intellect may be objected to by saying that the intellect is not intelligent and the individual self cannot be spoken of as being equal to it. Our answer is if the intellect is insentient relative to the self, the individual self as well is insentient relative to the Supreme self. 2. The same work in st. 64 of *sutra* 1 says: The individual self is to obtain by the grace of the Supreme the bliss of release even as it obtains the worldly experience as a result of its deed. 3. *Sivaprakasam* 57. The Lord makes the potency of the individual self manifest and will perform His functions by assuming His own embodiment. The potency is what is existent in the self. It will be explained at the end of the sixth *sutra*, the meaning of the expression that in release the individual self is equal to the Supreme Self. From this it will be seen how the internal schools

such as *Sivasamavada*, *Sankrantavada*, *Utpatti vada*, and *Avesa vada* which speak of the released soul becoming creators are also refuted.

Existence of spiritual dirt, Anava.

The author whose aim in the first aphorism is to establish the existence of the Lord, has also established the existence of the spiritual dirt *anava* by way of supplying the ground for reproduction or recreation.

Objection : If it be so, failure to deal with it as a separate topic for a topic will become a defect of composition known as imperfection, Answer : Doubt, *prima facie* opinion etc. which are necessary for a topic are available in the fourth aphorism where the definition of the spiritual dirt is given in the words 'not being conscious due to the presence of the connate dirt', so it will be dealt as a topic there. Here the author has avoided unnecessary repetition.

It may be pointed out that in the Sanskrit first *sutra*, there is no mention of the spiritual dirt. This objection should be answered thus : In the fourth quarter of the aphorism there is the word 'because of this' (*asmat*) : it means because of the spiritual dirt. There the expression 'created because of this' (*Srjatyasmat*) should be inverted and interpreted. Again it may be further questioned thus : Demonstrative pronoun will refer to the word that precedes and the word *mala* does not precede. So how can it be taken to refer to *mala* ? The answer is as follows : The condition that a demonstrative pronoun will refer to an antecedent is not strictly applicable in poetry : further that which indicates suggestion is a *Sutra*. So the word that occurs in the fourth *Sutra* is indicated by the demonstrative pronoun in the first *Sutra*. Those that do not know this will give the meaning of 'because of this', (*asmat*), as 'because of the above reasoning.' That meaning will be obtained from the context without any expression. It is for this reason Saint Meykandar has not said, 'because of the above reasoning dissolution is the primal source' but simply said, 'dissolution is the primal source' (*andam adi*).

Resume of the Sutra

Objections have been raised by the schools *Lokayata*, *Mimamsa*, *Buddhism*, *Jainism*, *Pancaratra*, *Polytheism* etc. in the following manner : Production and dissolution of the universe are not perceived, so the universe is everlasting. Even if it be taken to be eph-

meral, a nonexistence will appear and disappear momentarily having as the disappearing one as the basis for the newly appearing one and hence it is natural ; there is no compelling reason for taking it to be artificial for which we have to find out a cause. If it be taken to be an entity, it itself is self sufficient, for to assume the existence of two things will be contrary to the principle of parsimony. So it is not necessary to assume the existence of an Agent. Even if an agent is assumed to exist, it may be enough that agent be one among the deities mentioned in the Vedas such as Narayana, there is no valid means to establish the fact that it is only the Lord of dissolution that is the agent. Supposing that there is valid means, as we see greater and more complex objects like a chariot produced by a number of agents there should be a number of such lords of dissolution. In this way when objections were raised the following truths were established along the line of reasoning as follows : The universe has both the beginning and the end for the ephemeral nature of it can be established not only by scripture but also by inference and perception. Nonentity can never appear and so the universe is an entity. There cannot be two opposite qualities natural to the same thing. So to the involution and evolution of the universe there is the removal of the spiritual dirt as the purpose, and the world is an entity and the three changes are imposed on it by some other agent as in the case of the evolution of the pot etc. That agent must be the lord of dissolution for the whole universe will not dissolve in the lord of protection and others. Such a lord should have the divine qualities like omniscience, omnipotence, unlimited grace, independence etc. So such a unique Lord is enough for bringing out the evolution of the whole universe. The individual selves do not possess such divine qualities and so they will all depend on the supreme Being and they can never become identical with the supreme Being. This way the first aphorism establishes the existence of the lord both in general term and in particular by inferential reasoning.

Of the three topics, the first is the ground whereas the second is the conclusion. Again the second is the ground and the third is the conclusion. Similarly the close reasoning between the various parts of the second topic also should be noted.

The first aphorism is concluded

SECOND SUTRA

He, being one with selves and other than they, abides in implicit union with His consciousness-force that they experience going and coming, because of two fold works.

Intention :

The intention of the aphorism is given in the following words :-
This makes known how the universe is reproduced.

The first aphorism mentioned the Primal Being by the name Dissolution. This aphorism gives its definition. Thereby, the objection that without proving the existence of material and instrumental causes, to speak of the efficient cause is meaningless is removed, and it is expounded how the universe is re-produced from the Lord of dissolution.

The sequence of a particular topic is mainly based on three grounds. They are the conventional or established order, the removal of possible objection and the natural desire (Muraimai, Asankai and Avaynilai). Standard works on Indian logic and most of the Indian Philosophical works follow the order of mention of a thing by its name first, then its Definition and then the investigation (Uttesa, Lakshana and Pariksha). Here the second aphorism takes up the question of definition for the primal Being which is mentioned by the name *dissolution (Andam)* in the third topic of the previous aphorism. Hence it is a case of sequence by order : To remove the objection that without establishing the material and instrumental causes it is no good to speak of the efficient cause the valid means for their existence is given here. This is the sequence by the removal of objection. If the reappearance of the universe is not explained then there will be the curiosity to know how the universe is reproduced : So the exposition of reappearance of the universe is also given. This is a case of sequence by curiosity or inquisitiveness.

Of these three kinds since the sequence due to inquisitiveness is the best, the author has given the substance of the aphorism as the exposition of the reappearance of the universe which meets that requirement. But it should be known that the intention of the author is to understand the expanded meaning of the intention of the aphorism as given by us.

We obtain the relevance of the subject with the previous topic from the sequence by order, the relevance of the aphorism is obtained from the sequence of inquisitiveness and the relevance of the chapter (inner division) is obtained by the sequence by objection. The relevance of the broad division (section) is common to the first six aphorism in as much as they all deal with the nature of the eternal verities from the standpoint of bondage and the relevance of the work on hand is the investigation of the content of the wisdom portions. The last two will be clear even without expression. Thus understand the five kinds of relevance or sequence.

In considering the name *andam* (dissolution) as the mention (*uttesam*) the following doubt may be expressed. The word does not merely mention or indicate the thing or subject of discussion. Logicians have defined naming (*uttesam*) as mere mention of a thing by its name alone. But in the first aphorism the term *andam* (dissolution) is not a mere name ; it is used as the subject of the predicate *primal source* (*adi*) ; also the word itself is not a mere name, it gives the meaning that it is the agent of dissolution, which has the sense of definition and restricts the application of the word. But it is not so. In *Siva-prakasam* the mention of the verities defined and investigated are mentioned in the expression, 'It is the purpose of the various sciences, agamas and all to make known *pati*, *pasu*, and *pasa* (God, the self and the bondage)'. Here the mention *pati*, *pasu* and *pasa* is used to qualify make known (*Terittal*). In *Jnanamirtam* the mention *pasu*, *pasattodu pati ay perri* (the nature of investigating self, bondage and God) the names are used as the object of investigation (*ay*). So the names either qualify or are qualified. Nowhere the mention of the subject stands a mere name. So it should be understood that mention is the indication of the things so that they may require to be defined later. Hence to take *andam* (dissolution) as the mention does not involve any impairment or discredit. Even those that will not accept it as mention should admit it as mention since it

performs the function of a mention. The function of a mention is requiring to be defined or described later on.

It may be questioned that since the expressions, 'comes from the agent of dissolution' and 'the end is the beginning' themselves show that the definition of the prime Agent is that it should be the agent of those functions, there can be no requirement of a definition or description : it is a right kind of question. Though it is obtained from the expressions thus, yet since the other causes the instrumental and material are not established, the point of being the Agency itself will not be obtained : and so it will not be taken as definition at all. Hence that which has been obtained in a general way will require to be obtained specially. In all places definitions are given to import special idea of the subject which has been known in a general way. It should be borne in mind that if a thing is not known in general terms there will be no requirement for the knowing of its definition and if the thing is known specially there will be no use for its definition.

If it be so, to give the definition in a chapter intended for dealing with valid means of existence is not proper : so it may be said. The author has given the inferential reasoning for the existence of the efficient cause in the first aphorism and has proceeded to give the reasoning for the existence of the instrumental and material causes. But they happen to be the quality of the thing and possessed by the efficient cause and become included in the descriptive attributes of the efficient cause : in as much as they cannot be given separately, definition also is included in the same aphorism. Hence it cannot be said to be improper.

Characteristics of a thing are of two kinds: The first kind is a general one which is given with reference to the related things. It may be called a relative characteristic (*tatastha laksana*). The other characteristic is the special one which is given with reference to the thing itself, without referring it to any other thing. It may be called an absolute characteristic (*svarupa laksana*). To point out the crescent moon as being above the tip of a branch of tree is giving its definition in a general way or to give its relative characteristic. If the same object is spoken of as a streak of light rays in the form of a sickle the absolute characteristic is given. This distinction will apply to the characteristics of the eternal things. Among them, the characteristic which is classed as general is given here.

Again it may be asked why the exposition of the re-appearance of the universe is given instead of giving the exposition of the original, the first appearance of the universe. The following is the answer :

The universe is eternal and its original appearance cannot be apprehended by us. Also it is only the re-appearance of the universe from its efficient cause that is to be expounded here in order to satisfy the inquisitiveness. So it is only the re-appearance of the universe that is given here. However the original appearance of the universe should be known from line 22 of Porripahrodai, which says 'At first from the maya the subtle body and the related organs and loci are created and given to the selves. From the embodiment and others the twofold deeds arise because of the mind'.

In Tiruccadakam of Tiruvacakam there are two references. The first reference is that 'the Lord makes the plants grow without seeds !' In the second reference he says that 'the earth and the sky and everything is involved and it is got back by the Lord'. In these expressions, we should discern the distinction between the original creation and the re-creation of the universe. The first expression should be taken to refer to the original creation. The seed refers to, the works done by the individual selves. The term 'vilaivu' (growing) should be taken to mean the creation of the subtle body etc.

The paraphrase of the Aphorism

The Prime Lord who was denoted as the Lord of dissolution of the universe is in union with the selves, as the self is in the physical body, is different from them even as the sun's light is from the eye-sight and is immediate from and together with them even as the cognitive potency of the self is from the visual potency of the eyes. Having this relationship with the selves, He wills them to undergo death and birth, experiencing the results of their works which fructify by the action of the consciousness-Force which is known as His authority. This authority is in implicit union with Him, samavaya, the union of substance and quality.

The expression 'being one with and other than the selves' is interpreted so as to yield two meanings simultaneously. In Sivajnana Siddhi also it is said that the Lord is the same as the selves, different from them, and is together with them. In conformity with the

expression used in the first aphorism that the universe comes out of the Lord of dissolution, here also death is mentioned before birth.

The term authority is related to both the works of the selves and the Lord. From the expression, 'having the relation with the selves He wills them to undergo death and birth', we have the description of the Lord that He is the agent of the five fold functions. From the expression that the selves experience the results of their works which come to fruition being activated by His authority, we know that the Lord's consciousness-Force is the instrumental cause of the universe and the works of the selves are also instrumental through and depending on it. From the mention of the two-fold works (iruvinaiyin) we conceive of a substance which is the stay of the works, and that substance (maya) is obtained as the material cause. From the expression that the selves undergo death and birth in accordance with their works, we obtain that at the time of re-appearance the universe will have the multiplicity of the forms so as to conform to the fruition of the works of the individual selves.

It is enough for the purposes of definition that the Prime Being is the agent of any one of the five functions, creation etc. But in order to give no room for doubt to creep in, it is said that He is the agent of five fold functions.

The five fold functions are creation, maintenance, dissolution, disciplining and the act of grace. It is usual to use the term obscuration or screening instead of disciplining so as to represent the Sanskrit expression Tirobhava. Now these five fold functions should be understood to be of three kinds. They are the gross, the subtle and the subtlest.

Of these the gross are the well known ones. The origination and the dissolution are the manifestation and the disappearance of the universe. Maintenance is the abiding of the universe from the time of its manifestation till its disappearance. Disciplining is to be understood as the state of bondage, and the act of grace is the grant of the state of release.

If it be so, it may be questioned how maintenance can be considered to be an act of the Prime Being, for the universe which has been created will last till it is again destroyed ; so there is no need

for the effort of God in that respect. In the case of worldly kings they have to protect their kingdom from being destroyed by their enemies. But for the agent of dissolution there is no other agent of dissolution till He Himself wills to dissolve the universe. This is a welcome question. Of the two things that originate simultaneously one lasts for a longer duration and another for a shorter one. The reason for this difference is that the things differ in their inherent works that sustain them. So even sentient beings have to depend on different works for their different abidance. So this fruition of the different works depends upon the authority of God. So it is to be understood that even the state of maintenance is the effect of the will of God.

Further even as the changeless state of a water pot depends upon the effort of a person who bears the pot, so also the sustenance of the universe after its origin till its destruction depends upon the will power of God. Effort of God is to be understood as His will that the universe should abide for such and such duration.

Some people interpret the function of maintenance as not exceeding the limits of the field of action on the part of the sentient and insentient beings which are directed by God's authority to act. Even that idea is included in the term abide.

Let it be so, obscuration is the effect of the beginningless Mula mala : why is it classed as one of the functions of God. We shall answer this objection.

God is omniscient. So He knows the painful experience of all the living beings. He is omnipotent. So He is able to grant liberation to all the living beings. His names are Siva (the auspicious), Sankara (giver of bliss) etc. So He is full of mercy and when He sees the painful experience of any living being, He will not differentiate between them but will immediately be moved to remove their pains and will relieve them all and grant them eternal bliss all at once. Such a God having such attributes should know the bondage of works which have been produced and accrued from the beginningless past and their diversified effects of pain. He also knows the various potencies of the inherent mala, which prevent the attainment of release, but still He does not remove the cause of pain and grant supreme Bliss. This is because of the following reasons :

The presence of mala which prevents the selves from enjoying the presence of God may be compared to the presence of the anti-heat stone (kulikai) which prevents the heat of fire being felt by the palm of a person till an anti-spell, (which will act against the stone), is pronounced. The pronunciation of the anti-spell is comparable to the spiritual wisdom of the individual self which enables the self to experience the blissful presence of Lord directly. Till such a spiritual wisdom comes to the individual self, the self is not able to experience the presence of the Supreme Being. Here we may note the Divine will which acts according to the various potencies of the Mula mala. This will is called obscuration or screening. Saint Manikka vacakar has said in st. 20 of Tirup-porcunnam that God is bondage as well as freedom (bandamay vidum-ayinarukku). Here bondage refers to the act of obscuration of the Lord. So it will be clearly understood that obscuration is the function of the Primal Being. It may also be noted that because obscuration, is the function of God, the potencies of knowing and doing of the selves blossom and fade alternately and grow in ascending order like the stairway.

Some people will explain obscuration as obscuring the detestable nature of things which are detestable. The principles of Mala, Karma and Maya will hide the wisdom of the seer so that he may not see the object. There is no principle to obscure the objects other than these principles which hide the cognitive power of the seer to be established by valid means. So it is not different from the principle of bondage. Some will say to obscure the bondage is obscuration. It is no other than the function of grace. Similarly the various ways of explanations offered by other people also should be understood to be incongruous. Sivajnana siddhi in st. 87 of the 2nd sutra defines the power of obscuration as the potency of the primal being which directs the three impurities so that they may function. So it will be known that our explanation alone is the intention of the master.

The function of grace is clear and requires no explanation.

Now the five subtle functions are what happens to the selves after dissolution in the state of the loneliness (Kevala—the state when the selves are under the influence of Anava alone, when they are bare). For information the student is referred to the last portion of the 4th ch. of Gnana-pada of Mrgendra.*

The five functions classed as the subtlest are to be seen while the self has experience of the worldly objects. For the sake of brevity such things are not elaborated in this work.

If it be so, in the last aphorism the author referred to three changes; in this aphorism he confined himself to saying the ceaseless experience of going and coming. Even in the Agamas the three states of Laya, Bhoga and Adhikara and the three-fold potency of Harini, Janani and Rodhayitri alone are referred to : So how are we to obtain the five-fold functions, by the addition of obscuration and bestowal of grace. Well said ; obscuration is nothing but the direction of the fruition of the works by the will of God and it is included in the function of sustenance. Dissolution is becoming absorbed in the Supreme with the spiritual dirt and bestowal of grace is becoming one with the primal being without return. So it is included in dissolution, with this point in view, the five-fold functions are concisely referred to by the three-fold functions. Also since the three functions of creation, sustenance and dissolution are included in obscuration, the five divine functions may be referred to as *two-fold function* namely the bondage and release. In Periapuranam the expression occurs that 'the Supreme Bestows bondage and release on the selves'. When these functions are expanded, all the Agamas are consistent in speaking of the five functions.

This aphorism issues into the following four topics. They are (1) Being one with souls and other than souls, (2) the two-fold works directed by His authority, (3) experiencing death and birth ceaselessly, (4) abiding in implicit union with His authority. Hence there are four topics to be discussed under this aphorism.

Proposition First topic :

Here the primal being is one with these selves and other than they. The Sivadvaitins may speak of the relation of the primal with the insentient world. But Meykandar speaks of the relationship with the sentient selves.

Here the objection may be raised in the following manner. If this aphorism established the relationship of the primal being with the insentient world, then it will be useful for describing the recreation of the world in as much as it will mean that the primal being

establishing the relationship which is given here with the causal world will enable the manifestation of it in a grosser form. But if the relationship with the sentient world is spoken of, this issue will make no sense. This objection is raised without knowing the true import of the aphorism. In the last aphorism it was said that he who dissolves the whole universe will perform the five-fold functions and He will be the primal being. In that context the following questions will arise. The five functions which are attributed to the primal being should be done for His own sake, for others or they should be in vain. In the first case the primal being which is full of infinite bliss will not be in need of any function. In the second case further questions will arise such as what is the relationship between the self and the primal being. Are they one or different or one and different ?

If they are one thing like gold and the ornaments which are made of them, then it will mean that the functions are done for the sake of the primal being alone. If they are different like darkness and light, there is no nexus between the primal Being and the selves so that it may perform the function for the sake of the individual selves. If they are one and different like the expression in words and impressions in thought, then it is only the syadvada uttered by the Jains. Since the impression follows immediately the expression in order to make way for those who speak of the identity between them, they are described to be one and different. To attribute two opposite characteristics to a particular thing is only a fallacy. So it is not consistent to say that the functions are performed for the sake of others. Then the third alternative is to take those functions as being useless. In that case they are to be classed along with the action of mad men. It is not only mad men but also men gifted with high wisdom perform useless actions such as hunting, gambling, respiration, closing and winking of the eye, yawning and sneezing. So it is meaningful to take that the Primal Being also does these functions without any purpose. If it be said so the following considerations are in point.

Hunting is undertaken by king and others in order to prevent the wild beasts from becoming numerous and aggressive and destroy the wealth of a country. Or it may be undertaken in order to find food for oneself and it is not done without any purpose or use. Even gambling is undertaken to defeat the enemies by employing doubtful means or for the sake of making money by shrewd betting. So even gambling is not done unless it be for some useful purpose. It is very

clear that respiration is a necessity for the sake of living. Winking happens in order to protect the eyes. Yawning and others take place involuntarily, having their own causes. Even plays such as building houses of sand and drawing chariots which are indulged in by young boys and girls are done with the object of equipping themselves for future life being directed by the parents and they yield in addition the momentary pleasure which is enjoyed by children. All these actions have their purposes and uses. So purposeless and useless actions are done by men who are mad and the imbeciles only. For these reasons to take the agency of five functions as the definition for the Primal Being is an error in definition. In this manner objection may be raised. That objection should be removed and it should be established that it is not an error in definition. Because even though the Primal being is different from the individual selves he is in union with them and performs the five functions for the sake of those living beings. Thus to take the sentient world as the object of union of the primal Being enables one to answer such questions and refute such objections. So it is not proper to say that it will not make sense.

Sivajnana Siddhi and Tiruvacakam refer to the functions of the Primal Being as play. The intention behind the expression is to think of His performance as being effortless. They are performed only by His will-power. There is also the usage among the people to say that it is a play for Sattan to carry a weight which is equivalent to five kalam. Here play does not mean that it is a useless performance, but it means only that it is done easily without any painful effort. So to think of the five-fold functions of the Primal being as being purposeless and useless without knowing the sense of the term play, is not admissible in the least.

Also it should be noticed that when the Primal Being undertakes to reproduce the universe, it is in immediate relationship with the selves even as the cognitive potency of the self is immediate with the potency of the eye to see while seeing an object. The intention of the author in formulating the first line of the aphorism in such a way as to lend itself to simultaneous double interpretation is to show that because the Primal being is one and different from the selves, that is no error in definition and because the same line is taken to mean that the Primal being is immediate with the self, gives the manner in which the reproduction of the universe takes place.

Even the second sūtra of the Sanskrit work introduces the topic with the word 'to the selves' (pumsam), so to refer to the insentient world by implication which has no connection there, is not admissible.

We should notice that the author has repeated in this aphorism the form of the grand expressions that occur in the upanishads 'Tattvam asi' etc., which mean 'Thou art that', 'This is that, I am that etc.' So it is not proper to understand in that context the insentient world which has no connection. Since it is the import of the grand expression that is dealt with here, the author in the tenth aphorism refers back to this idea in the words 'Even as the Primal Being has been the self' (Avane tane akiya anneri).

Also if the relationship of the Primal being with the individual self is given, then the relationship of it with maya, works and the effects of Maya (Mayeya) which are under pervasive (with the self) is also obtained as the same without being mentioned.

Now the question is what is the valid means of establishing this relationship. This is answered in the formulation of the ground, which is as follows :—

'For if the term advaita be taken to mean one, there is that which thinks as one, and the word will only mean not two.' Meaning : The vedik expression Advitiya or advaita alone is the valid evidence for holding the three-fold relationship. The noun *dvaita* means two. The negative prefix *na* which appears as a prefix will negate the existence of the thing denoted by the following word as in *aprakasa* ; or it may denote the opposition or the contrariety as in *adharma* or it may denote similarity as in *abrahmana*. Of these if we take the first sense it will mean *no two* and as the absence of dualism is in one, the term will mean one. If we take the sense of contrariety and interpret as one which is contrary to two, as contrariety implies two things, it will mean that the supreme is one which is the opposite of two. If we take the third sense it will mean *not two* and it will mean that the two things are inseparable.

Of these three senses if we choose the first which seems to fit in, it will mean one ; but it will imply that there is another consciousness that thinks as one : also the negative prefix *na* when it is attached to the numerals will express similarity and will denote a sense which

is common to one and two ; there is no usage indicating other senses as when used before other words i.e. absolute negation or contrariety. So the expression *Advaita* itself, without requiring any other evidence, will denote inseparableness : hence the proposition.

The expression of the ground gives two reasons for the conclusion and the required coordinating conjunction *and* is to be understood.

Immediacy or togetherness of the Primal Being with the individual selves is thus established : from this it will be clear that the two entities are different in substance and one by union. In the third illustrative verse of this topic, there are words 'udangiyaindu', Ninru and pirippinri : from them, the reasons, *by union, in substance* and *being the line of the life* are derived from the three-fold nature of the expression.

In order to clear the objection that the answer involves manifold solutions, the author gives illustrative verses. Among them the following illustrative verse strengthens the idea of being one with the self.

The prime Being is one with the individual selves even as the self which is in possession of the physical body which is made of tissues and organs, answers when the body is called by the name given to it. The self cannot be the body, nor the body can be the self. But the self can act as the body and different from it ; so also the prime Being cannot be the self, nor can the self be the prime Being. But the prime Being can be the self and different from it. But the self cannot act like the Prime Being.

Even when two persons stand together locking their hands together only the person who is addressed will answer to the call. But in the case of the body-self complex, the self answers the call addressed by means of the name given to the body. So the relation between the self and the body is known to be one of identity. But still the self is different from the body. In the same manner the prime Being can identify itself with the individual selves while being different from it.

This verse strengthens the idea of identity with the individual self of the Primal Being, even though they are different in substance.

The Vedas qualify the Primal Being not only by the expression *advaita* but also the word 'ekameva' (one only). Since this expression

does not mean otherwise, it may be objected to by saying that it is not proper to say that the Prime Being is in inseparable relationship with the self which indicates the difference between the two entities. The author answers this objection in the following illustrative verse and thereby strengthens the idea of the difference of the Prime Being from the self.

The expression 'ekameva' occurring in the Vedas means *one only*. The intention of the Vedas is to assert that the Prime Being is one only. Thou who sayest that the Prime Being is one only is Pasu, which is bound by pasa (fettered one, bound by fetters). In Svetasvatara it is said that the splendrous one who creates the sky and the earth is one (dyava bhumi janayan deva ekah : Sve. III. 3). It also says in III.2. Rudra is one only. He does not stand as the second (Ekohi Rudro nadvitiyaya tastuh). Brhadaranyaka I.IV. II says 'This universe was at first Brahman only'. (Brahmaiva idam agra asid ekameva). So these expressions clearly state that the prime Being is one only. But it may be cited that the scriptures say that there is nothing if there is no Brahman (cara carati jantunam Siveka prana uchyate tam vina na pravrtti syat, aksaranam akaravat). This will not confirm the idea that the universe is not different from the prime Being. It means only that the universe depends for its existence on the prime Being even as all the letters depend on the first letter 'a'. This illustrative verse strengthens the idea of difference between the prime Being and the individual self.

The expression 'akara uyir' which is taken to mean vowel 'a' is also interpreted by others as nada, the primal sound for all objective consciousness.

Now the question may arise as follows. If Brahman is one it is proper to say that it is one only at all places. But the Vedas speak of Brahman which is advitiyam. The expression advaita or advitiya will indicate two things. If so Brahman which is one is not to be described as advaita or advitiya. In order to respond to this question the following illustrative verse is given by the author and thereby strengthens the idea of togetherness or inseparableness stated in the proposition. The illustrative verse is as follows :

2. 1 (b) The foot of the omnipresent Lord is in advaita relation (with the selves) like tune and sound, and like fruit and its essential

sweetness. So the precious scriptures speak of advaitam in those places instead of one only. Advaitam means not two.

This verse defends the use of *advaita besides ekameva* by saying that it indicates the inseparable relation of the prime Being with the self and hence it is not contradictory to saying that the prime Being is one.

The adjective *omnipresent (enikum am)* is used to denote that the primal Being and the self are inseparable, like the quality and the thing qualified and yet they are not so. The quality and the thing possessing the quality are given as analogies to show that the two things have the relationship of being pervaded and pervading ones.

To give separate examples for the three relationships might show that the Truth is expressed multiplewise (*anekanta vada*) and a definite answer is not given. So in order to show the definiteness of the answer a single example is given in the following illustrative verse to show the three-fold relationship.

2. 1 (c) God is different from the self, is one in union and is inseparable in impulsion, even as the melted wax mixes with the powdered sand to form the touch stone and remains inseparable. Since the prime Being enters into myself in the state of release I shall say 'I am the world' now.

This example is given to show that the three-fold relationship exists between the prime Being and the self as is shown by a single example namely the melted wax, and the powdered sand in forming the goldsmith's touch stone. In the upanisads it is said by Vamadeva Rsi and others that they themselves are the universe. Even in Sarva-jnanottara agama it is said on the part of the self that it is all, it transcends all and it creates, sustains and destroys all. So naturally a doubt will arise whether even the individual self will possess the advaita relation with the universe, which is specially attributed to the primal Being. In order to remove the doubt the author says that in the state of release as the prime Being enters into himself he will say that 'He only is the world.' It means that by spiritual meditation of the identity of the supreme Self, the individual self becomes free from all its fetters and inherits the grandeur and supreme bliss of the prime Being. The formula used in the meditation of spiritual identity is

'Soham or sivoham which means 'He I am' or 'I am Siva' respectively. The Tamil word 'inru' (today) indicates the state of release. From this we should understand that in order to inherit the qualities of Siva, it is enjoined by the Scriptures on the individual self to perform the meditation of identity denoted by the expression 'Soham' and as a result of it the individual self becomes free from fetters and inherits the blissful glory of the supreme Being. Thereby it should not be thought that even the self is the same as the Supreme Self. Advaita relation with the universe is natural to the Supreme Being whereas individual self derives it from the Supreme Being by entirely depending on it. Supreme self is self luminous and the individual self inherits the luminosity from the Supreme Self by making itself transparent, shedding its opaqueness. The opacity of the self is due to the defilement of the Mula mala.

This also explains the problem that is involved in the saying of Sri Krishna to his disciple Arjuna that he was the universe. He also showed to him the cosmic form which is only due to the primal Being. He also said that Arjuna should resign every other thing and worship Him alone. Arjuna in his turn promised to obey His order, but persisted in Siva worship till the end of his life. Also he saw the flowers strewn on Sri Krishna in worship of Siva on the head of Lord Siva. In these things we should understand that Sri Krishna posed himself as the prime Being as he was the spiritual master. He also received initiation from the sage Upamanyu and thereby realised his self and through it the Lord and also practised the meditation indicated by the formula Sivoham.

Saint Meykandar gave the expression that he would say he was the universe in the state of release at the end of this topic. If he had not said so, then the attribute, *being in advaita relation with universe*, which is a special one for the prime Being, will be misunderstood as being a general one common to both the prime Being and the individual self. In order to remove that misunderstanding the author has added the expression at the end of the topic.

From this we should understand that this section refutes the mayavadins who say that the prime Being is non-different from the universe as the gold ornament is from pure gold. It also refutes those who uphold the theory of transformation by saying that the relationship between the prime Being and the universe is like that

between the word and its meaning. It also refutes all other religionists who speak of the difference between the prime Being and the universe as light is from darkness. Thus the import of the term advaita is expounded by means of reasons and illustrations.

In giving the meaning of the fourth illustrative verse there are some people who do not split the stanza so as to yield two different but connected senses. The nature of the stanza will not lend itself to interpret the stanza as being one connected expression. But they will take the expression to mean 'I am the prime Being. Now I shall call myself the universe.' (Yane ulagenban inru) To give the interpretation like that involves repetition of what is given by the words, 'He is the world' in 'I am the world'. For this reason and similar ones, that kind of interpretation should be condemned as being the wrong one.

Taking the hint from this topic the author of tertiary (Sivaprakasam) has given one full stanza under the heading the special features of Saiva siddhanta. The following is the explanatory meaning of the stanza.

At first he says that Saiva siddhanta is like darkness to external religionists. Here external religions means the three-fold religions, the outermost, the outer and the inner-outer. Even if Saiva siddhanta is explained to these people, they will not be able to follow the teaching because they do not believe in the basic truths which are six in number. They are the prime Being, the individual selves, the spiritual dirt which is equated to darkness, the deeds, and the two material causes of the universe.

The inner schools Pasana vada Saivas etc., which are described in Sankarpan Nirakarana believe in the basic principles even as the Saiva Siddhantins do. They differ only in the general and special attributes of the six principles. So if Saiva siddhanta principles are explained to them, they will be able to understand and appreciate the Truth. Sivaprakasam says that the schools of thought including the Sivadvaita are not familiar with Saiva Siddhanta. This is not contradictory to our assertion that they can understand the truth after our explanation. So Sivaprakasam says that Saiva siddhanta is like light with the inner schools of thought.

Also bear in mind that Sivadvaita is also called Nimitta karana Parinama vada. This was explained in the salutation to the assembly of the wise. As the pure saivites who are dealt with at the end of Sankarpa Nirakarana are not included among those that are not familiar with Saiva siddhanta—the schools upto Sivadvaita alone are separated, it is clear that they can easily understand the import of Saiva siddhanta by the mere listening to the explanation of this work, Sivajnana Bodham. They are so near the Saiva siddhantins that they are mentioned only at the end of the work, Sankarpa Nirakaranam.

It should be noted that Sivadvaita Saivas are different from Suddhasaivas. The former hold that the prime Being which is the efficient cause of the universe is also the material cause in as much as it has conjunction with the material cause namely the maya. But the suddhasaivas will not subscribe to this view.

In determining the valid means for the true knowledge the logicians and others consider the sense organs etc., as the valid means. But the valid means should not become the objects of true knowledge whereas the sense organs etc., are objects of valid knowledge. So to say that they are the means as well is not correct. The potency of the individual self which knows things, being influenced by the grace of the Lord, is the only the means which objectify even the sense organs. So in Saiva siddhanta the potency of the individual self is held to be the valid means proper and the sense organs and others are called valid means by courtesy usage. This is brought forth by Sivaprakasam by the expression that in Saiva siddhanta the valid means is that which is the means of the so called means said by others.

The identity like the gold ornament and gold, the difference like darkness and light, the identity and difference like the word and its meaning and their inadmissibility are explained already. To embrace the philosophy of Saiva siddhanta is rare. This rarity is indicated by the stanza in the expression that Saiva siddhanta is the result which follows by observing the laws and rules that are given in the Vedas. So it follows that Saiva siddhanta wisdom cannot be obtained unless the rules and regulations given in the Vedas are not followed.

The expression (pirivarum attuvidam) *advaita inseparable* suggests the meaning of the expression advaita. The expression means in-

separable (not two). This meaning is precious one indicated by the expression, 'Cirappinadhay'.

The implication of the expression, Saiva Siddhanta the essence of Vedanta (Vedanta-t-telivam saiva siddhanta-t-tiran) is to refute the views of those that say that Vedanta and siddhanta are different and to make it clear that vedanta is general capable of being interpreted in many ways like an aphorism and that Siddhanta is only its clear interpretation like the commentary. This is an anuvada or repetition of what is said in Matanga agama etc., viz. Siddhantam is the greatest bliss, this tantra which is the essence of the veda. Here the expression Vedanta means the end of the Vedas, i.e., the upanisads. It is not the monistic work which is known as Vedanta. whose author is Vyasa. At the conclusion of the work the author has repeated the same idea by saying, the truths yielded by the head or the conclusion of the Veda. It is not a mere repetition, but it is to distinguish between the correct interpretation of the term Vedanta and the so called Vedanta which refers to the work on monism.

Tiran or subdivisions means the divisions of the work into general and true or special.

Saint Umapati says, 'We intend to depict the subdivisions of Saiva siddhanta to make it known that even though the primary and secondary have subdivided into general and true and have dealt with the subjects, yet since they have not explicitly said so, the distinction cannot be understood. So we explicitly make this distinction and explain the intention of the two works. The name Saiva siddhanta is used to distinguish it from other schools such as suddha saiva etc. To explain advaita as given in Saiva siddhanta three illustrations are given in contra-distinction with the three the ornament and gold, the word and its meaning and darkness and light. They are the physical body and the self, the eye and the sun's light and the cognitive potency of the self and the eyesight.

There are persons who could not follow the arrangement of the words etc., and they have given inadmissible interpretations as they conceived.

Concluding para of the 1st topic of the 2nd Sutra :

The commentator takes pains to give the correct interpretation of several stanzas of Sivaprakasam : perhaps he felt that the work

was not gifted with proper commentary as it deserved. We have a commentary by Madurai Sivaprakasar who is known for his comparative study among the Tamil works on Saivasiddhanta. The chief drawback of this commentator is that he did not pay attention to the grammatical construction of the stanzas which he interpreted. He was guided by the general impression that a stanza left on his mind. The commentator, Sivagnana Munivar felt worried about this and began to criticize him with respect to the meaning given by Madurai Sivaprakasar of the very first stanza of Sivaprakasam which is an invocation to Lord Ganesa.

The stanza says that the minds of those that regularly worship the feet of Ganesa with flowers that rule the honey bee will become pure and will not function in such a way as to accrue or experience the effects of deed which transcend the strength of human efforts.

The subject of the stanza is 'minds' (ulam ana) which is plural. The predicates 'will become clear' (veli akum) and 'will not think to meet the deed' are in agreement with the plural subject. But Sivaprakasar takes the second predicate to mean that the deeds will not think to meet (vinai kuda ninaiya). Here Sivagnana Munivar criticises him that he is unable to separate *valitaya* as *vali taya* in order to make it agree with the plural subject.

Second topic : In the first topic the definition of the prime Being that it is the agent of the five cosmic functions is emphasised by stressing on the inseparable relation of the prime Being with the individual selves for the sake of the individual selves.

But even then the question of the prime Being's agency is not established without doubt. For when the individual selves are given incarnation, some selves are enjoying pleasure and some are suffering from pain, some are made to enjoy the pleasures of the heavenly world whereas others are sent to hells ; some are made to be born in high caste, and others are made to be born in the low caste. Some enjoy long life and others have only short life. So the Lord who makes the individual selves have different experiences thus cannot be considered to be impartial and gifted with grace. So He cannot be the prime Being. Thus there is objection with regard to the characteristics of the prime Being. The objection is to be removed and thereby the existence of the instrumental cause is to be established.

Thus the relevance of this sutra is to be shown with regard to the chapter on pramana.

The proposition : ' Now the two-fold works come to these selves by the authority of the primal one.'

The force of ' Now ' is to indicate the relevance of the topic as shown above. Even if the phrase ' *to these selves* ' is omitted it will be understood, but the author has chosen to express it explicitly in order to refute the two schools of thought the Sankhyas and the carvakas. Sankhyas hold that the two works are earned and experienced only by the buddhi tattva which is an evolute of prakrti and not the individual selves. The carvakas and others hold that they are earned and experienced by the physical body.

These selves means *the selves that are privileged to be in inseparable relation with the primal one as indicated in the first topic.*

The two works are the accumulated deeds which have been earned in a number of previous births. Since the primal one creates the heredity and environment in accordance with the deeds that have already been performed by the selves, it is not proper to say that the Lord is partial and is devoid of grace. Hence the defect pointed out in the characteristics of the primal Being is removed.

Again since the primal one depends for its action on the two-fold works performed by the individual selves, it may be objected to by saying that the primal one is not independent in His action. It is only the person who is independent of an action that is defined the agent. Hence again the defect in the characteristics of the primal one may be pointed out. This is something like coming to the toll-gate even if a longer route is chosen in order to avoid it. So the objection may be raised. But in the proposition it is said that the two-fold works come to the selves the authority of the primal one. So the two works which fructify only by the authority of the primal one cannot be considered to be independent and hence the characteristics of the primal one is thus restored to be free from the objection. But still objection may be raised in the following manner:

If the existence of the two works is asserted, then the existence of the primal one becomes unnecessary. If on the other hand the

existence of primal one is admitted the existence of the two-fold work becomes unnecessary. This is something like the dance of the peacock which uses only one of its legs at a time. This objection is removed by the following reason :

Ground :

For, His authority operates through two-fold works just as the protector of a city acts through the guard of the imprisonment in punishing his subjects with imprisonment.

Even as the kings use their authority through a guard in imprisoning a person, so the primal one uses His authority in making the two-fold works performed by the selves condition their experiences in their various births. So to make use of the two-fold works is not unnecessary. Here the work of the king is used to illustrate the work of the primal one, for the functioning of the primal one is similar to the functions performed in the world. Siddhiyar also says that the functioning of the Lord is like the King's function. Here 'Padikaval' is an expression conveying a kind of punishment that is pronounced by a king after judicial enquiry, on a person who has deviated from his regular path.

Saint Tirunvukkarasar in his hymn on 'Tirukkodika' has used the expression 'Padikaval'. Here it means the punishment by imprisonment. The following illustrative verse strengthens the meaning of the reason by establishing the existence of the two-fold works as against the school of carvaṇas and explaining how they are being experienced by the selves and how the residue is left over to be experienced in future and how the two-fold works are devoid of independence.

Verse 1 :

The existent works produce and the self enters that body with a view to experience ; there is action for the future in experiencing the fruit of the previous work. Just as the ground bears the fruits of the toil of the cultivator, the Providence gives the consequences of the deeds. The deeds cannot of themselves attach to the doer.

To establish the existence of the deeds on the basis of the theory of the implication of the effect in the cause the author has said, ' The

existent works produce'. It is said that the self enters the body, with a view to refute the Sankhyas who say that it is only the insentient internal organ buddhi or intellect that experiences the pleasures and pains of the existent store deeds by attaching itself to the embodiment which is the locus of experience.

The expression 'there is action for future in experiencing the fruit of previous work' answers the question if the previous deeds are exhausted by experience how does work occurs for future experience. The remaining portion of the stanza refutes the school of Mimamsa which holds that the deeds themselves will manifest as pleasures and pains, and there is no necessity for the intervention of the sentient God.

While experiencing the fruits of the past deeds, the self is characterised by the necessary conditions of desire or aversion. This desire or aversion becomes the seed of deeds for the future experience. This is explained in the twelfth sutra while the topic of association of perfected selves is being dealt with. The illustration of the king was used in order to show the necessity of the deeds for God's function. The illustration of cultivation of the land is used here in order to show that the deeds cannot function without the intervention of God. This topic is elaborately dealt with in Sivajnana Siddhi. So we refrain from elaborating here any further on this topic.

The second illustrative verse meets the objection which is raised as follows. The deeds are insentient and so they cannot by themselves reach the selves as experiences of pleasure and pain. But the selves are sentient and they can select the experiences due to their deeds. So an omniscient God is not required for this. For this reason it is not proper to say that the deeds become experienced by the selves through the authority of God. The following illustrative verse refutes this objection and strengthen the reason given.

For a magnet to attract a piece of iron, they should be brought together in such a way that the piece of iron is within the magnetic field. In the same manner even though the self is intelligent its cognitive power is limited and unless the experiences due to it are brought within the area of its consciousness by the omniscient Lord, it cannot have the experience of its deeds.

If the Lord does not do this, who else knows the deeds performed by the self and makes it experience its result in the state of bondage.

The individual self experiences the result of the deeds being placed in the embodiment which itself is the result of its previous deeds.

The selves are devoid of cognition, unless they are enabled to know. The deeds are insentient. Maya, the material cause of the universe is dependent on the authority of the Lord. So by elimination it is only the prime Being that should help the individual self to experience its deeds.

Now the question may be raised whether the deeds have their origin or not. If they have origin to say that a thing which is not in existence will make its appearance fresh is against the theory of satkarya vada. If they are considered to be eternal, then there is no need for a person to bring it nearer to the self so that it may experience it. This objection is met by the following illustrative verse.

If the husk of the rice grain and the verdigris of copper are considered, they are not new, but are connate. In the same manner maya, mala and Karma are beginningless. But their functions of becoming patent and potent are to be done by the bountiful one even as the opening and the closing of lotus flower are caused by the sun's light.

The words valli, mala and karma signify respectively maya, anava and karma. The author who has to establish the beginningless character of the deeds has also asserted the beginninglessness of the spiritual dirt and of the material cause because of their belonging to the same class. The reason which were given for the establishment of the existence of the karma equally holds good for the existence of maya, the material cause, because karma cannot exist alone, but can exist only as an attribute to maya. The theory of satkarya vada also establishes the existence of maya, the material cause of the universe. The first sutra has already established the existence of mala which is the spiritual dirt.

The effects of the three-fold bondage

The effects of the spiritual dirt are of seven kinds. They are infatuation, conceit, desire, worry, sorrow, physical disability and diversified feeling. Infatuation is connate with the self till it is cured of the spiritual infirmity, causing the remaining six effects. The principal nature of this effect is to be seen from the fact that the other

six effects do not manifest unless this one is present. It is the disability of the self in being attached to sense experience, even though it is clearly known from the scriptures that the sense experience is to be avoided and the practice of turning oneself within is to be strived after.

Conceit is that feeling in the self which enables a man to think very highly of his worldly possession.

Desire is that which attaches the man to his worldly possession.

Worry is that which produces sufferings on the part of the person when the possessions are removed from him as a result of his past deeds.

Sorrow is that which makes the man lose his health when the possessions are taken away.

Physical disability is the effect of sorrow on the physical body. Diversified feeling is that which makes a man feel highly of his possessions and feel a sort of contentment saying there is none to depend upon for his own happiness.

Now the effects of the deeds are pleasure, pain etc.

The effects of maya are the body, physical and psychical instruments, the locus and the things experienced. The effects of maya are mayeya. As the illustrative verse mentions the will of the bountiful we have to understand the existence of the authority of the divine being which is called tirodhana sakti. It is the divine will which enables the spiritual imperfection to act as infatuation etc ; so that the individual selves may grow in nature and stature and be rid of its imperfections.

As this aspect of the divine will works through the potency of mala, it is classed along the mala by the courtesy usage. So the five imperfections of (1) the mala, (2) maya, (3) the deeds, (4) the mayeya and (5) the tirodhana Sakti will be understood clearly.

The existence of the two deeds

Now objections may be raised as follows. The instrumental cause for the actions of the Divine being may be taken to be His authority alone ; if the two deeds of the individual selves are also taken

to be instrumental for His actions the Divine Being which acts according to the deeds of the individual self loses its independence and fails to become the prime Being. But it is not so. Even the two deeds of the individual selves are instrumental in His actions. If they are not instrumental then the impartial and graceful prime Being cannot make the individual beings experience pleasure and pain according to their deserts. A king does not lose his independence simply because he bestows his grace on those who conform to his authority and punishes those who are defective in their behaviour. The wasp maintains its independence in its action of providing suitable environment and food to its young one and making it grow into its full stature. So also the prime Being does not lose His independence simply because He acts according to the deserts of the individuals. Unless the deeds of the selves are taken into consideration the granting of different experiences to different selves cannot be justified.

A potter requires the instruments like wheel, the stick etc. which are his own possessions. But in his action of making the pot he does not depend upon the order of others. So he is considered to be independent. The same truth applied equally to the prime Being. Also all the effects do not manifest themselves simultaneously ; but their manifestations take their own order. Hence it should be concluded that they depend upon the deeds of the individual selves.

It may be argued that as the past deeds of the various selves are already in existence, their effects should become manifest simultaneously. But it should be observed that the deeds become converted into effects only according to the maturation of them. Even though all the deeds are in their potential state, yet the prime Being chooses among them the deeds that have become mature enough to be experienced by the selves. Maturation does not consist in the modification of the thing like a raw fruit becoming fruit. Modification is applicable to the things that have a patent appearance. But the deeds have no form. Nor is it to be considered as the passage of time, for the deeds that have been performed at a later time are experienced before those that have been performed earlier. So maturation consists in a deed becoming perfect in all its requirements which are instrumental to it. So even though the deeds which are to confer the organisms of devas, human beings, beasts etc., to an individual self have already been performed and are in store, yet all the

bodies do not come into existence simultaneously, for it is only the deeds that are mature enough to take effect become converted into their effects.

The existence of the deeds performed in previous births is believed in also because without the belief, there will be no use in adhering to the moral code which prescribes certain actions to be done and prohibits certain other actions not to be done.

From the stories like that of Daksha, it is learnt that unless there is God's grace mere observation of the moral codes does not produce result. So it may be concluded that the result of observing moral codes is only the gaining of the grace of God. So it may be argued that there is no need for the belief in the existence of the deeds done in previous birth. But this is incorrect. In the case of Daksha, the good deeds performed by him are destroyed by his egoism. So they have not resulted in the promised good. The moral codes are the dictates of the divine will. So observance of such codes will produce the results prescribed. It is not proper to think that such observations are ineffective.

If we compare the actions of the prime Being to the actions of a king we may have to conclude that even God will behave partially as some of the kings behave themselves. We see some of the kings favouring those who do not adhere to their orders whereas they do not favour those who strictly observe their desires. Here the comparison is not suitable. The worldly kings may go wrong either because they do not know the intention of their servants or because of their own ignorance which is the result of their destiny. But this aspect of the king should not be attributed to the divine Being.

A scriptural contradiction may be pointed out as follows from the above arguments. We have to conclude that there are deeds to be experienced even in the pure world which go by the name *suddha adhva* i.e., the effects of the pure *maya*. But it is said that the *vijnana kalas* have only one *mala*, whereas the *pralyakalas* and the *sakalas* have two and three *malas* respectively. Also it is said that there is no *karma* in the pure worlds. But a deeper study of the scriptural works will enable us to see the real significance of the sayings which lead to no such contradictions. In the *Pauskara* it is said that there are *evolutes* from Time onwards to earth even in pure *maya* as in the

case of impure maya. But those evolutes are pure. From this it should be concluded that all the evolutes that are attributed to the impure maya are existent in the pure maya as well. But they are pure in nature.

Further it should be understood from the following dictates that even in pure maya there are pure deeds. The following are dictates of the Āgamas. (1) Those that chant the appropriate mystic syllable which will lead them to the worlds in the pure maya and those that worship the mantreswaras, the vidyeswaras, the sadasivas and others will attain the worlds. (2) The deeds are of five kinds namely the worldly, the vaidic, the adhyanmika, the adhimarga and mantra. Because of their qualitative difference of being pure, mixed and impure, they are respectively superior to one another and are included in the five kalas nivrthi onwards and will yield the pure, mixed and impure experiences respectively. The expression that 'There is no deed in pure adhva' should be taken to mean that there is no *impure deed in that locus*. Unless we take it to mean thus it will be contradictory to the above Agamic dictates.

The question may be raised that the good and bad actions of an individual are alone considered to be the cause for the pleasure and the pain for the person and to suppose a potential state of the actions done by a person, 'apurva' is not necessary. The answer is that the actions like the performance of a sacrifice have an end to them, but the results of such actions are experienced only after a passage of time. So it is necessary that there should be something which causes the result which comes after a lapse of time. So it is supposed that as soon as the kinetic form of an action disappears, it gives rise to a potential form of it and that potential form is called apurva or sancita and that causes the experience due to the action. Sancita is also called punya and papa, the good and evil results of action. The experience take the form of pleasure, pain etc. Apurva means the invisible.

It may further be mentioned that the posterior non-existence of the sacrifice etc. as soon as they disappear will remain and cause the experience due to the actions and the supposition of the existence of apurva is not necessary as it is against the principle of parisimony. As all non-existences are not operative it is necessary that the potential state or apurva of sacrifices should be supposed.

It may also be advanced that as every action that is performed by a devotee results in the satisfaction or happiness of a deity which presides over that action and as that satisfaction or happiness persists long after the performance of the action, the satisfaction or happiness of the connected deity alone may be supposed to produce the results of action ; it is unnecessary to suppose the existence of sancita. Even this is not admissible, for as soon as a person is satisfied he will produce the results of that satisfaction. It is not necessary that that satisfaction or happiness should take time to produce its results. So it is absolutely necessary that we should posit the existence of the potential state of an action as soon as it disappears called *apurva*.

After these considerations one may be led to think that instead of supposing the existence of some other thing called *apurva*, the action itself may be supposed to exist till it fructifies. But the manifestation of any action is supposed to last for two moments only. After the second moment the action is supposed to be unmanifest. Well said, our idea of *apurva* or *Sancita* is only the potential state of an action which last even after the disappearance of its manifestation. This is the final conclusion.

It was said while dealing with the theory of the effect being in the cause, *satkarya vada*, that it is only the potential form in which a thing exists after the disappearance of its patent form is the thing's destruction. This may be remembered as this principle runs through out this philosophic system.

The moral codes express that the sin is also the result of failing to do a thing at the proper time ordained for it, in that case there is nothing patent to become potent after its disappearance. There can be no destruction to inaction as there is in the case of an action.

Scriptures speak of the sin only in the case of failure to do a thing at a particular point or duration of time. When the point or duration of time passes away, the failure to do a thing in that point or duration becomes destroyed and the destruction of the time remains in a potential form which yields the result of the failure. This is the proper answer for such a question expressing doubt.

This deed or work which has been dealt with so far has three states. The first state is named *agamiya*, when it is being acquired

This is acquired by the means of mind, word or body, through the six principles of the environment letter etc. The six principles of the environment are the letters, the word and the mystic spells, the evolutes, the loci and the kalas (varnam, padam, mantra, tattva, bhuvana and kala). Agamiya is the manifested organ state of the deed. Then it remains in an unmanifested or potential form till it matures. Here it is called sancita or good and bad deeds. It remains attached to the mind of the individual in the material cause of the world and causes the future status, age, and experience of a person. The deed which causes the status of a person is called janaka, that which causes the age is called taraka, and that which causes experiences is called bhogya. It should be noted that apurva or sancita is the synonym of the good and bad deeds (papa and punya). When it fructifies it is called prarabdha and the experiences issue through oneself, or through the others or through nature. These means of experiences are respectively called adhyanmika, adhi bhautika and adhi daivika respectively. The six principles of environment will be clarified in the third thesis of this aphorism.

Verse 24 of Jnanamrtam gives a list of actions that are to be performed with the mind, word and deed. The following is the translation of the verse. The activities of the mind are faultless perception, mercy, forgiveness with patience, absence of greed, gratefulness, uprightness, impartiality, dignity, absence of envy, absence of avarice, kindness towards suffering living beings, wishing to others happiness, fortune, greatness and personal beauty even to a greater extent than one's own.

The activities that can be performed by word are as follows :— They are exposition of ethical principles, absence of backbiting, truthfulness, learning scriptural works, refraining from evil words, uttering kind words, avoiding harsh words, exposition of philosophical works, speaking humble and useful words, non-swearing and avoiding cunning words.

The deeds that can be performed by means of the body are doing penance, discriminate charity, generosity unforgetfulness in one's duties, worship of deities, performing oblations, maintaining good conduct and character, not keeping company with men who kill animals for their food, not committing killing, theft, lust, false-hood and non-addiction to liquor, mastery of sense organs, showing kindness

even to the worst enemy, hospitality, rearing grooves of fruit and flowers, having the manliness to consider women other than one's wife as mothers, deepening water reservoirs, digging wells, poor feeding, maintaining monasteries where men practise religion and connected learning, raising temples etc.

Refraining and avoiding the opposite deeds also are classed as good ones.

These deeds are attached to the mind of the doer and during the time of dissolution it will be attached to maya into which the mind dissolves and during the time of reorigination, it will cause the organism and the instruments etc. of the person.

Also this deed is classified into five kinds. They are the secular, vedic, adhyatmika, the transcendent and the mystic. Of these social service such as providing drinking water, cool shades etc. to the strangers are called wordly deed the secular, and they enable a person to have experiences in the locus under nivrtti kala.

The second kind is called vedic deeds and it originates by the performance of sacrifices etc., which are enjoined by the Vedic works and cause experiences in the loci belonging to pratistha kala.

The third kind is called adhyatmika and it is originated by doing worship and observing asceticism etc., enjoined by the Vedic works and causes experiences in the loci included under Vidya kala.

The fourth kind is described as the transcendent one (adhi marga) and is acquired by Yogic practices and it leads to experiences in the loci included under Santi kala.

The fifth is called the mystic one (mantram) and they are acquired by wisdom practices such as concentrating on mystic spells and they lead to the experiences in the loci included under santyatita kala.

Of these the first and the second kind are called impure deeds since they lead to experiences in the impure loci which are included under nivrtti and pratistha kalas. The third kind is called the mixed deed as it leads to the experiences under the mixed loci included under Vidya kala. The remaining two kinds are called pure deeds as they lead to experiences in the pure loci that are included under santi and santyatita kalas.

Among the teachers there are two opinions. Sivaprakasam says, that the deed is eternal because it originates in its destruction (Sivaprakasam-16). It means that the three kinds of deeds namely, that which is done (agamya), that which is accumulated (sancita) and that which is fructified (prarabdha) are respectively the cause and effect of one another as the one has its origin in the destruction of the previous one. Also the fructified deed leads to future deed agamya. So the eternity of the deeds is one similar to the continuity of floods and not like the eternity of the prime Being or the individual selves.

The eternity consists in its continuous existence as in the flow of the floods.

On the other hand there are also scriptural expressions such as follows : Tiruvarutpayan says, 'The prime Being, the individual selves, the spiritual darkness, the deed and the two kinds of maya, these six are eternal entities.' Jnanamritam also says that 'the deed is eternal as the spiritual darkness and the material cause maya.' Also any effect should have necessarily the three causes namely the material, the instrumental and the efficient one. So there is another enlightened opinion that the original cause which is called root deeds (Mula Karma) should be eternal even like the other eternal verities.

Of these teachers the Tamil grammarian Tolkappiyanar holds the opinion that there is the original deed called Mula Karma. In an aphorism of the second chapter of his work, he speaks of the eight causal principles of an action. Of these he mentions the deed itself as one of the causal principles.*

So the potential form of singing is to be taken as the cause or the causal state of the actual singing. Hence we have to conclude the causal deed exists eternally even as the other verities such as the prime Being etc. are.

The existence of maya

Since the existence of the deed is established, it easily follows that the maya to which the deed is attached also exists. It is a well

* When a man sings, the action of singing itself is taken to be one of the causes of the singing. It is explained as follows. We may say that the man does singing, here singing is the object of doing. The object should exist in a potential form before it manifests in the kinetic form.

known principle that action and quality cannot exist independently. But they will be seen in conjunction with a substance. Maya is the substance to which the deed is attached.

If it be so, it may be objected to on the following lines. It is a well-established principle that the cause and its effect should co-exist in the same locus. It is only the individual self that experiences both pain and pleasure, which are the results of the deed. So the locus of the attachment of the deeds is the individual self and not maya. But it is not so.

Even in the opinion of those that hold this view, it is an accepted fact that the deed performed for the sake of a departed ancestor by son attaches to the performer and does good to the departed self. The father performs certain ceremony called jata karma at the birth of a son. This ceremony attaches to the father and does good to the son. So the well known principle that the cause and effect should co-exist in the same locus will apply only to those things which are not governed by the scriptural dictates.

The cultivation of the land by the farmer does not attach itself to the farmer, but attaches itself to the land and does good to the farmer. Also the deed which has origin and destruction is non-sentient and it should attach itself to a non-sentient thing not to the self which is sentient. The pain and pleasure which are the effects of the deed come to a self only through the effects of maya. For all these reasons it is established that the deed attaches itself to the maya and not to the individual self. So the existence of maya will be evident.

The nature of Maya

1. *Refutation of the view that void is the material cause :*

The nature of maya is held in various ways by various schools of thought. Let us examine those ways in detail.

One of the schools of thought belonging to Buddhism (Madhyamika) holds that the material cause of the world is mere void. We also experience a rain of dust coming from the void which is the sky. A conjurer produces various shapes at his will. Saint Manikkavasakar in verse (66 of Tiruvacakam) says that the Lord

produces plants without seeds. Tirunavukkarasar in his hymn on Tiruvarur sings of the Lord that He produces shoots without seeds. In the second aphorism Meyakandar speaks of the two deeds, but he does not mention the term *maya* in that aphorism. So it is possible that void is taken to be the material cause of the universe. But it is not so. We have already said that the effect should always be implied in the cause. It is said in scriptures that the evolute earth extends to a distance of 100 crore *yocanas*. So though the earth may not be present in its manifested form in the sky its presence in the unmanifested form is accepted. So the rain of dust does not come out from the void. Even the conjurers are able to produce things from their appropriate material causes alone. So their action does not contradict with the theory that the cause has its effect in an unmanifested form.

Again the author of the aphorism speaks in the section dealing with the results (*payangal*) of the separation from the residual effects of *mala*, *maya* and strong deeds. (*Mala mayai tannodu valvinai inre*—Aphorism 10). So his intention of speaking of *maya* implicitly even in this aphorism cannot be questioned. He does not express the word *maya* simply because it can be understood from the term, 'because of the two deeds', and from the theory of cause implying its effect, which was dealt with in the first aphorism. So it should be concluded that *maya* alone is the material cause of the universe. The intention behind the scriptural utterances by Manikkavacagar and Tirunavukkarasar have already been dealt with. It was said that they referred to the first creation of the world where the individual selves have no deeds performed. There is also the alternative construction to the saying by Manikkavasakar. The expression may be taken to mean that the prime Being makes His appearance without any seed i.e., He takes up the form from his own potency of grace. There is also another saying '*vittinri vilaindadu*' (it has grown without the seed). The same meaning may be attributed to the expression made by Tirunavukkarasar. To give an interpretation which is contradictory to the Siddhanta school of Philosophy is not proper.

Also the word seed may be taken to indicate only the material cause instead of taking it to mean cause in general. In that case we may give the following interpretation. All the seeds that are found in the world are limited by time and place so that they cannot be

obtained without effort and search on the part of those that require them. They are also separate from the persons who desire them. In the case of prime Being, the material cause is not like that. It is as eternal and all pervasive as the prime Being Himself and is in togetherness with Him being pervaded by Him and depending on Him. From such a material cause the primary Being creates the universe. Hence the expression differentiates between the material cause used by the prime Being from the material causes used by wordly men.

It is explained in the commentary of Brahma sutra by Srikantah that this is the intention behind the utterings of Sivapurana. When they say that the primal source has created the universe without the material cause even like the yogins and the siddhas. This also removes the objections raised by those that aver that the prime Being is the material cause of the universe.

If we require the prime Being to have a material cause to its creation the material cause may not be obtainable sometimes and so the prime Being will be unable to perform its creation and thus it will land the prime Being with the difficulty of inability to produce. In order to throw light on all these things Saint Umapati said in Sivaprakasam, 'if it be objected to by saying that the prime Being cannot do its functions without the material cause and will be confronted with inability, the material cause maya is eternal even as the prime Being and the latter will make manifest the things implied in maya, the material cause. Serious thinkers will not say on this account that the independence has been bestowed on the prime Being by the material cause.

2. *Refutation of the view that the primal atom is the material cause*

From the above the listener may agree that void cannot be the material cause. But among the Buddhists the sections that advocate the aggregate theory of atoms and the naiyayikas hold the primal atoms as the material cause of the universe. Even those that advocate maya as the material cause believe in a subtle state of things to be the material cause. The word anu or the primal atom is a synonym for subtlety. For these reasons it may be said, that it is incongruous to postulate maya as something different from the primal atoms. If it be said so, the following reasons lead us to the contrary.

Atoms that are ordinarily seen in a bundle of rays of the sun have their own parts. There is no valid source of knowledge to postulate the existence of primal atoms that are subtler than they. Even if there be a valid source those things that are insentient and many are effects and they should have a cause subtler than they. The word gross is used to describe effects which are perceived as many and limited by space and time. When these things disappear they become one, pervasive and invisible. So they are said to be subtle. Simply because of the usage of the word subtle, we cannot say that the primal atoms are the material cause of the world. So it should be held that maya alone is the material cause. If the primal atoms are not taken to possess parts in themselves it will be contradictory even to the conclusion of the naiyayikas. They say that two primal atoms when they contact partially become one double atom. Here one may question them whether the contact which they speak of is whole or partial. If they say the contact is a whole one, then it is contradictory to their definition of contact that it is a relation which implies pervasiveness and non-pervasiveness (avyapya vritti saiyogam). They should reply that they touch each other at one part and have no contact at the remaining part. From this reply it follows that even primal atoms have got parts in them and so are effects only.

3. *Refutation of the Sankhya view that Prakrti is the Ultimate material cause :*

As it is accepted generally by all that prakrti which is considered to be the ultimate material cause of the universe, it may be accepted as such. To say that there is some other thing called maya to be the ultimate material cause is not supported by valid reasoning. Thus the objection may be raised.

According to the Sankhya, the three qualities which are unmanifested and are in equilibrium is what is called prakrti. In that case it is subject to origination and destruction and hence it should have its own material cause. So it is not proper to say that prakrti is the ultimate material cause.

If it be so, according to Saiva Siddhanta, it is only the unmanifested state that is mulaprakrti. So it is one only, and origination and destruction cannot be attributed to it. Hence what is the objection to considering it as the ultimate material cause of the universe?

Well said. The subtle state of the five elements is tanmatra. The ego (ahankara) is subtler than tanmatra. The intellect (buddhi) is subtler than the ego. Mulaprakrti is still subtler. The evolutes kala etc. are subtler than mulaprakrti and maya is subtler than kala etc. So prakrti which is grosser than kala etc., cannot be viewed as the ultimate material cause. It is the material cause for things that are grosser than it. It cannot be considered to be the ultimate material cause since it is the effect of the evolute kala which is subtler than prakrti.

If it be so, suppose mulaprakrti is subtler than kala etc. and maya is grosser. What is wrong in such an assumption? It is not so. Even if it be held so, there is no speciality in assuming two ultimate things as being existent maya and mulaprakrti. There is no specific advantage in differing in nomenclature only. The derivation of maya is as follows.

Ma means involution, *Ya* means evolution. So, that which is the cause for all effects which resolve themselves and from which all things arise is called maya. So the ultimate cause which is the subtlest of the things conceived is maya. This is the conclusion arrived at from the derivation of the words.

4. *Refutation of the view that Brahman is the material cause :*

The view that void or primal atom or prakrti is the material cause of the universe is opposed to the dictates of the Vedas. So to hold that they are not the material cause will be admissible. But the Brahma vadins say that the Brahman is the material cause of the universe is commonly accepted by the Vedas and other scriptures. So this view seems to be admissible. The conclusion that this view is a commonly accepted one can be seen from the dictates of the upanisads (Mundaka 1.1.3) that He, who realises Brahman realises all. It is said in the 11th book of Tiru Murari, Koyil nanmani malai, stanza 24, which follows the Vedas : ‘ The movable and the immovable things of the universe originate from *you* and have their end in *you* even as the foam, the waves, the confused whirling of the water and the drops of water which are big and small and countless have their origin and end in the ocean itself’.

In Tiruttandakam and other scriptures it is said that the Lord stands in identity with the earth, water, fire etc. Even in the works

of Karaikal Ammaiyar it is sung, 'The knower is Himself, the Agent who makes it known is Himself, the knower who knows in the form of knowledge is Himself, the Reality which knows is Himself, the expanded universe the earth, the sky and everything is Himself'. This is uttered with emphasis. In this manner the same thing is uttered in many places. So it should be concluded that the Brahman is the ultimate material cause of the universe. If it be said so it is to be refuted for the following reasons.

It is an invariable law of Nature that all the qualities that are in the cause should also be in its effect. So the universe which has its origin in the sentient Brahman should also be sentient. But this is not so. The world that originates is insentient. It may be pointed out and said that curd which has its origin in milk does not possess the quality of the milk.

The straw and the husk that have their origin in rice do not possess the qualities of the rice. The grass which has its origin in its root does not possess the quality of the grass root. The scorpion which originates from cow-dung does not possess the qualities of the dung. The cobweb which has its origin from the spider does not possess the qualities of the spider. So the invariability of the quality of the cause and the quality of the effect fails. So it may be said. But it should be made known that the intention behind the assertion that the quality of the cause should be invariable from the quality of the effect is that the qualities of the cause and those of the effect should not be contradictory. It is a general truth that the quality of one thing cannot be the quality of another thing. The qualities of the effect should be such as not to contradict with the qualities of the cause, they should be similar. So in the examples cited the principle of invariability does not fail.

The cause for the cobweb is subtly in the stomach of the spider. The body of the scorpion alone has its origin in the cow-dung. Further these are all different kinds of the way of birth. So there can be no doubt in these cases. Further it is said in the Vedas, (know Maya to be the material cause and the owner of the maya to be Maheswara' Svetasvatara IV. 10).

The terms prakrti, material cause, upadana, inherent cause, samavayi karana are synonymous. Brahman is not characterised

at any place as the material cause in the Vedas. The above expression in the Svetasvatara upanisad is contradictory to the views of those that hold Brahman as the material cause of the universe. So it is only the maya, and not the Brahman that is the material cause of the universe.

The following view may also be advanced. From the above statement it is known that maya is the material cause and from the scriptural statements that had been pointed out above, we come to know that Brahman is the material cause. So it is proper that Brahman and Maya taken together may be considered to be the material cause. The appropriateness of this view is strengthened by the following expressions in Tiruvacakam. Tiruvacakam says, 'Salutations to Him that is in the form of five of the earth. Salutations to the four that are in water. Salutations to the three in fire. Salutations to the two in air. Salutations to the one in the space'. It is also said, The Lord has settled illumination in the Sun. He has placed coolness in the beautiful moon. He has created heat in fire. He has made the sky such as to mingle with all other things. He has made air to be moving. He has placed sweet taste in water which is capable of producing shade. He has expressly placed solidity in the earth. This way he had placed crores of qualities in the respective things. If it be said so the answer is that this is not the way in which they are to be construed. It should be made clear when it is said that both Brahman and maya are the material cause whether the intention is that both the things combine together like the two fibres that make one rope and become the material cause, or as in the birth of a body, where body alone undergoes change and the self appears to suffer the change along with it. Maya alone is the material cause, but the Lord being qualified by maya should also be considered to be the material cause.

If it be said that both maya and the Lord act together and become the material cause, it is not admissible, for in that case it should be admitted that the Lord also undergoes change even as the maya, which is contradictory to the scriptural dictates that the Lord does not undergo change (nirvikari). For the same reason the view that the Lord is the material cause as being characterised by the maya is also untenable. For, when we say that the individual self being characterised by the body undergoes change, it is admissible ; if in the same manner, we state that Lord is also the material cause since He

is characterised or qualified by the maya, we should admit that the Lord also undergoes change. This is because being characterised or qualified is not any other thing than either the quality, or the qualified, or the relation between the two. In that case it is contradictory to the saying that the Supreme Being is immutable. If the meaning of the word characterised or qualified is taken to be something other than the three things mentioned, it is impossible for anybody to assert that the Lord is the material cause.

Also, as there is no illustration to show that the Agent and the material cause are the same, it cannot lend itself for inferential proof. So it may be said that the verbal testimony is stronger than the inference. This is not a proper answer to the issue in question, for inference will not contradict scriptural authority. If, in some cases they are contradictory, then inference will lose its validity in all places and will lead to the conclusion that inference cannot be taken to be a valid source of knowledge. In that case the propositions, the grounds and the illustrations that are given in this work will become futile.

In cases where scriptural knowledge seems to be contradictory, it is only with respect to the inference that the strong and weak points of the scriptural knowledge should be determined. The place of inference consists only in this fact. So inference cannot contradict with the scriptural knowledge. It is a means to determine whether the intention we ascribe to a scriptural statement is correct or incorrect.

As the above two cases are not admissible and as there is no way of answering the question the following may be said. Maya alone is the material cause. But as the Lord is the main support and combines with it and acts by His will power which is immutable taking it as His locus, He also should be considered to be the material cause. In that case since the Lord does not undergo any change, to say that the Lord is the material cause is significant only in expression. So is the same as our conclusion. Even Srikantha who says that the Lord is also the material cause since He is qualified by the maya is of the same view. He deals elaborately with the question and arrives at the same conclusion. It can be seen in Sivaditta mani dipika also at the end of the janmadhi karana. It should be understood that though the school of Sivadvaita does not contradict the view of Siddhanta Saiva, yet, it contradicts it in expression. So the school is placed as a separate one.

The same thing can be understood by the refutation of the school in the following words in Sankarpa Nirakaranam. 'You have accepted the twenty-two evolutes in addition to the fourteen which all other Vedic schools accept. You also accept the five states of consciousness for the individual self and three elements of bondage, the individual self as well as the Lord. In contradiction to what you have accepted you assert that in the state of release there is one only. Your nature is like that of a blind licentious man who considers the mother, the wife, the servant maid and the sister as belonging to one category. If it be said that without mutability the efficient cause may be taken to be the material cause because of some relationship, then it can be equally asserted that the potter also is the material cause for the pot likewise. So, what is the gain in adhering to the distinction only with respect to expression.

If it be so, it may be asked what the meaning is of the expression that a man who knows the Absolute Being knows everything. It is said in the fourth thesis of this aphorism that the world is the possession and the selves are the bondmen of the Supreme. So if the nature of the Master is known, the servant, the material cause and the instrumental cause are included as His subordinates in the characteristics of the Lord. So the nature of the selves as well as the worlds will be clearly known. This is the meaning of the saying that the knower of Brahman knows all things.

It is also answered by some that the expression is used in consequence of the importance and the fruitfulness of the action, even as we say that a knower of the king knows his ministers and others.

The expression that the effective world has its origin and its end in the Lord, is said because the Lord is the main support of the material cause. There can be no objection that in the simile the foam, waves etc. which arise and fall in the waters are said to have their origin and end in the ocean, which is the space which contains the waters of the ocean. It should also be known that there can be no question with regard to the statements of Ninratiruttandakam etc., because they are made to refer to the relationship of the world with the Supreme Being namely they are one, different and together with the Supreme Being.

If it be so, the following question may arise. In the first thesis of this sutra the first line was interpreted as so to give the relationship

between the sentient world and the supreme Being. But here the same thing is quoted when the relationship between maya and its effects with the Supreme Being are being considered. This may be supposed to be improper. The relationship of the supreme Being with the individual selves which are dependent upon the supreme Being is given in the first thesis. On that account the relationship of the supreme Being with maya, deeds and effects of maya which are dependent on the individual selves will be obtained without expression. So the transference should be considered to be proper. With this intention the author of the tertiary has sung as follows.

‘The nature of maya, the effects of maya and the continuing deeds is darkness if the spiritual impurity characterises the individual self. Their nature is illumining if the individual self is steeped in the light of grace.’

There are some among the Saivites that do not know this truth and say that there is no relationship between maya and the supreme Being and that there is only the presence of the supreme Being in maya and so the supreme Being is not the support of maya and maya is an independent entity. They unconsciously fall in line with the school of Pasupata and give the interpretation of the above stanza in their own way. It should be noted that here is relationship between the pervasive and the pervaded and that the pervasive is the locus and the pervaded is a thing supported by the locus. Saint Meykandar has cited the comparison of the ocean, water and salt to pervasive entities. It is only to point out that there is the relationship of the pervasive and the pervaded ones and the locus and the thing supported by the locus that the simile has been used. Even though the root impurity anava is a pervaded one, yet as it is an inimical one even as darkness to light there is no relationship between anava and the supreme. There may be people who may say that maya also is the opposite of the supreme Being. But it should be noted that in Sivaprakasam it is said that anava and maya are opposites and they are like darkness and light. In Sivajnana Siddhi it is said that maya is a potency to the supreme Being. In Sivajnana Bodham it is said that maya is dependent on the feet of the Lord as its evolutes are the possessions and the selves are the servants of the Lord. These scriptural expressions will be contradictory to the view that there is no relationship between maya and the supreme Being.

Also it is said in the second aphorism that the world is the thing possessed and the selves are the servants of the supreme Being. The effects of maya such as the earth, water, fire etc., are the embodiment of the supreme Being along with the individual self. So the relation of the supreme Being with the individual self also exists between the supreme Being and the effects of maya which are pervaded by the individual self.

Still since the individual self is of the same class as the supreme being in as much as it is held to be an intelligent entity the relation with the supreme Being of the individual self has got a special significance. If it be asked what the relation between the prime Being and the individual self, whether it is conjunction, inherence, tadatmya (the same thing acting as two) unity or svarupa (identity), the question will be answered in the sixth sutra. Hence the same relation that exists between the prime Being and the individual self holds equally good between the prime Being and maya and the deed.

If it be so, it will not be proper to call maya and the deed as principles of bondage, it may be objected to. If such an objection arises, the answer is as follows :

If the individual self is bound by a mala and is called pasu, maya and the deeds which are pervaded by the self are called bondage (pasa) even as the potency of the Supreme Being is called the potency of obscuration (Tirodanasakti) and if the self is freed from mala, gets rid of the name Pasu and is in conjunction with the Light of grace, maya and others which are pervaded by the self get rid of the name bondage (pasa) even as the potency of obscuration (Tirodanasakti) and reign supreme as Light of grace.

The characteristics of the verities in Saiva Siddhanta are called general or relative (True or real) according as they are dealt with in respect of the state of bondage or the state of release. This was explained while expounding the Introductory stanza. So the above answer will not be taken to be indefinite or doubtful as the Syadvada of the Jains. Tiruvarut payan, st. 8 of the second chapter dealing with the nature of individual selves, puts the question, 'Are there not things on the earth that are dark in darkness, and luminous in

splendour*?' This was with the object of providing illustrations to show that such things cannot be called indefinite as in the case of syad vada.

The explicit meaning of the stanza of Sivaprakasam, commencing with the words 'Maayai ma maayai maayaa' is that maayaa, maayeya and the deed will stand even as the self stands in relation with the primal evil or with grace. This can be seen from the continuity of sense from the previous stanza and from the expressions used in the stanza.

If it be so, 'what is the import of the continuity or the sequence', it may be inquired into.

The previous stanza ends with the saying, 'Wisdom capable of enabling one to attain the highest value is the only wisdom (independent wisdom) they will say' (Nannalam pera nirainda naname nanam enbar). Here the particle (alone) does not indicate emphasis for there is no doubt whether that wisdom is wisdom or not; for the same reason it does not imply a question (or interrogation). If it be taken to be silent without conveying any meaning, to assert that wisdom is wisdom is mere repetition (redundancy). Since other shades of meaning of 'e' as well are unsuitable, the meaning of distinction (pirinilai) only is to be attributed, and the wording is taken to mean that the wisdom of the Supreme that confers the highest good alone is independent and not the other two wisdoms which respectively are egocentric (pasu Jnanam) and manifested by the material evolutes (paasa Jnanam). So the next stanza, beginning with the words 'maayai maayeyam', purports to give the nature of the two kinds of wisdom. This is done by indicating the nature of the sentient and insentient things that possess the two kinds of wisdom (chit jadangalin tanmai). Also it should be noted that the stanza in question qualifies the supreme, independent wisdom by the clause, 'which is free from the qualities of the good sentient and the insentient' (Nar cit jadangalin tanmai taavaa). Of the two kinds of wisdom, the nature of the egocentric (pasu jnanam) was already given while dealing with the nature of self. So it was merely referred to and

* The crystal, the eye and the sky are dark in darkness and luminous in splendour: like-wise, the self assumes the nature of the verity which it contacts. It is pasu when in contact with mala and is Siva when in union with Siva.

the other wisdom (paasa jnana) is clarified by giving the nature of wisdom of the self. In order to give the *true nature* of maya etc., by illustration, the general (or relative) nature of them is also given. It is said that if the self is under the influence of delusion caused by mala, the three things will be mere darkness and if it be under the influence of the Light of grace, they will be luminous (marul enin irulaay nirkum, arul enin oliaay nirkum). Thus the distinction is enforced with the implication that the egocentric wisdom is not independent and the wisdom due to the material adjunct is not wisdom at all by itself. So the wisdom due to Light of grace, the divine wisdom, alone can be said to be independent. In other words, Sivajnana alone is independent, for what is called the wisdom of the self depends upon the elements which influence the self. The elements are the mala or the Light of grace, what is called the wisdom due to the material adjuncts (paasa jnaana) is not wisdom by itself, for the material adjuncts act either as darkness or Light according as the self is influenced by mala or Light of grace ; they are subservient to or pervaded by the self.*

But there are people who interpret the stanza as giving the nature of tirodhana sakti (obscuring potency) and they give the meaning as follows : The obscuring potency will act as darkness when the individual self is under the influence of evil principle and it will act as light when the individual self is under the influence of the Light of grace. This interpretation has no connection with the import of the previous stanza. It is the intention of the author of Sivaprakasam to expound and enforce the meaning of the distinguishing particle ' e ' (alone) in the previous stanza.

Since this truth did not dawn upon them, they considered the difficulty of giving the nature of maya, its effects and the deed under the caption, the truth of illumination (jnanavaymai). So they made maya, its effects and the deed as qualifying adjuncts to the individual self and understood without any connection, the obscuring potency as the subject of the sentences. The nature of the obscuring potency has already been dealt with by the author in stanzas 8 and 36. So this kind of interpretation is a false one. The ideas conveyed by the author are already (1) as the obscuring potency contributes towards the maturation of the evil principle, it is also referred to a evil principle

* The commentator takes great pains to bring out the real implication of the expression of Umapati Sivam.

and (2) the obscuring potency of the Lord which acts with anger against the evil principle at first transforms itself into the soothing grace. So to repeat the same thing in the above stanza is not proper. The same meaning may be derived from the stanza by taking marul as the version in both the cases and taking the word 'maya' to mean differently. But, even in that case, the same idea has already been expressed by the author as already indicated. So the interpretation is an incorrect one. It should be noted that the author will not repeat the things mentioned in the general section in the special section also. But it may be pointed out that the nature of the states of consciousness of the individual self, and the nature of the self are dealt with in both the sections, general and special. But the distinction between the expressions should be carefully understood.

Now coming to the main point it may be objected to by saying that the potter is not the main support of the earth which is the material cause of the pot, whereas in the original case where the potter is given as the thing compared, the Supreme Being, is the main support of the material cause of the universe. Here it should be noted that in all cases of comparison it is only a part of the nature of the original thing and the thing compared will be common. Both the things will never be identical. As the common thing is only a partial one different things are introduced as illustration to establish the different natures of the original thing.

If it be so it may be asked what the appropriate comparison is for the truth of the agent, being the main support of the material cause. Well said. It is well known that the bodies of the parents are the main support of the sperm and the ovum of them which are the material causes of the bodies of children and the parents are the agents. The main support of the material cause of the cobweb is the spider which is the efficient cause. To take an example from the epic poem of Skandam, the main support of the bodies of the army of the celestial beings that issued forth from the mother Goddess named Kali the efficient cause, is the body of the Goddess. This way a number of illustrations may be cited. By the same proposition the schools such as Pasupatas are also refuted.

Maya vada

(The theory of indeterminable nature of maya advanced by the absolutists)

The absolutists say that maya is neither real nor unreal, but it is indeterminable. Even the name maya means that it is something illusory. The word is derived from ya ma sa, which means that which disappears when inquired into is maya. From such an indeterminable maya, the intelligent prime Being is reflected as in a mirror which produces virtual image.

When such an image is produced, that image appears as the universe consisting of earth, water, fire, air etc. even as a rope appears to be a snake and mirage appears to be water. As it is so, the universe is only the illusory appearance of the prime Being.

That maya is indeterminable does not merit the seriousness so as to be considered a thing to be refuted, for the following reasons. First of all it is not the view of any one of the accepted schools ; there can be nothing to cite an example to show that a thing can be neither real nor unreal. So it is not possible to establish the truth by inference either, as there can be no analogy to be cited and a thing which cannot be established by inference can neither be established by verbal testimony. Also in the case of mirage appearing to be water it is only water that is false and the mirage which exists cannot be said to be indeterminable. So it cannot be given as an illustration for proving the universe to be indeterminable. Those who hold the view of transfiguration will say that it is only the appearance of one thing as another. But it is only an unreal thing that seems to be another by similarity. The universe is real and the reality is determined by all the valid means including perception. So how can such a universe be taken to be the transfiguration of the intelligence that the prime Being is. This reason also will establish that it is wrong to suppose that maya is indeterminable, for if maya is indeterminable the universe which is its effect should be a void.

The reality of the universe may be objected to, for the following reason. If the universe is taken to be real on the basis of perception the reality can be established only with respect to the present time. Perception cannot establish the reality of a thing with respect to all

the three times, past, present and future. Also since perception takes the affirmative form, that this is a pot, this a cloth etc., it does not show a thing in the negative form as this is not cloth, this is not pot etc. So the difference cannot be perceived unless the non-difference of a thing is understood. Thus perception ceases to be a valid means for establishing a universe possessing difference.

If it be attempted to establish perception as the valid means of knowledge of the universe of difference on the basis of the common acceptance of all men that the cloth is different from part and pot is different from cloth, it is not proper. Because such a perception is determinate and all determinate knowledge is delusive. Since perception is not the valid means for establishing the existence of the universe of difference, inference cannot be the valid means either, for there is no room for finding a reason which is concomitant with the conclusion. Since these two fail to be the means of establishment, verbal testimony will also be of no help. Even those that accept the determinate perception as a valid means must hold that unless there is the knowledge of non-difference there can be no knowledge of difference, for there is no negation of a thing, unless it is obtained previously.

Since it is so, the awareness of non-difference which occurs at first must be taken to be valid. Since that is valid, the awareness of difference which occurs later is not valid, for it depends upon the former. Since the awareness of non-difference is obtained by perception, the following inference and the verbal testimony which asserts the non-difference of the universe are also valid. The inference is as follows :—

The pot is not different from cloth, for it is a substance, even as a piece of cloth.

For these reasons, the vedic sentences, which imply difference declaring such as those the existence of sky, air, fire, water etc., are contradictory to these valid means and so should be considered to be of courtesy usage not significant. Since there is no valid means for the awareness of difference, it follows that there is no object of such an awareness of difference. Supposing that both the valid means of awareness and its object are existent, what is the relationship between the object and its awareness. Is it the relation of oneness? or the

causal relation? or conjunction? or inherence? or a different one? If such a question is raised, no proper answer can be made.

The relation of oneness is that in which the same thing seems to be two and act inseparable. If such a relationship of oneness is attributed to the awareness of the pot and the pot itself, the pot should exist within the mind even as the awareness is. But the pot is objective and the awareness is subjective. So the relationship of oneness is not applicable to them.

If the causal relationship is attributed to them, as the cause and its effect are co-existent it is not proper that one is absent while the other is present. But in the state of dream there is the awareness of pot etc., and there is no pot etc. For the same reason conjunction and inherence cannot be attributed to them. If it be said that the relation is that which exist between the object and the objectifying awareness, we cannot exactly know what is meant by an object. So the relationship between the awareness and its object is not obtained. Hence it should be held that the universe of difference is not known to valid knowledge and is untrue. Since the universe is untrue it is proper to hold that its material cause maya is indeterminable. This way the absolutist will argue the case with questions and answers. If it be asked what the defect is in their argument, we shall give the answer as follows.

Refutation of the view that maya is indeterminable :

This universe is a real entity and it is proved by perception. It is free from doubt and error and what is perceived in the present time is true for all times. Though in the indeterminate perception the difference is not perceived, in the determinate perception which occurs after doubt whether it is a post or a man, the perception of difference occurs, for the perception takes the form that it is only the post and not the man. In a perception which is erroneous the rope may appear to be a snake for a person at a particular time and a garland for another person at a different time. But in perception which is free from doubt and error, a pot is seen as a pot at all time by all persons. So perception is a valid means of knowledge. Further, a rope appears to be a snake because of certain characteristics which are common to both of them, for example the characteristics of being long and bent. But in the case of the Absolute being and

the universe there is no such common attributes. In fact, the Absolute Being is sentient whereas the universe which consists of pots and others is insentient. So it is not proper to say that the Absolute appears to be the universe. As the indeterminate perception is the cause of the determinate perception, whatever is in the effect should also exist in the cause. So if name, class, attribute etc. do not exist in the indeterminate perception, they will cease to exist in the determinate perception also. Hence the awareness of difference in the indeterminate perception exists in a subtle and unmanifest form.

It has been said by the opponent that the knowledge of non-difference occurs first and the knowledge of difference which negates it occurs next and so the knowledge of the non-difference is the valid one. But it is not admissible. Since there is the subtle awareness of difference in the indeterminate perception, it is only when a person knows the difference that he is able to negate that. In other words, the knowledge of non-difference is a later occurrence whereas the knowledge of difference occurs at first and so knowledge of difference should be given preference in the question of validity.

If validity of a knowledge must be determined by its nature of being the same during the three times, present, past and future, the difference between cloth and pot is non-contradictory, whereas the non-difference between them is contradictory. So perception is a valid means of knowledge in establishing the existence of the universe which is manifold. So the syllogism which was used at first to establish the existence of non-difference of the universe becomes a false one. If it be not so, on the basis of that inference a person who had gone with the intention of bringing a cloth, should bring a pot. But this is not so. From this even the scriptures that speak of the non-difference do so by courtesy, it should be seen.

Moreover suppose the question whether the means of knowledge adopted for establishing the illusoriness of the universe is true or false is raised. If the answer is true, then it is clear that the means of knowledge which exist within the universe is true. On that account the universe also is true, not illusory. If on the other hand it is taken to be false, a false means cannot be taken to be valid. So, as there is no valid means for establishing the illusoriness of the universe, it is obtained as self-evident that the universe is a true entity.

If it be so, it may be asked what the relationship between the valid knowledge and the object of that knowledge. It must be said that the relationship is that which exist between the known and knowledge, the object and the objectifier, or the revealed and the revealer. If you say that it is not what exists between the object and the objectifier, it will go against you, who say that the universe is illusory, for it ceases to be the object of your knowledge, that shows the universe to be illusory.

If it be so, it may be questioned what constitutes an object. That which is manifest when a particular awareness arises, is the object of that awareness. Here manifest means capable of being manifested. For all these reasons it is established that there is valid means of knowledge and there is also the relation between that knowledge and its object. So the object of that valid means which is the universe is an existent thing and its material cause maya should also be an existent ; it is not proper to say that it is indeterminable. If it be so it is contradictory to your scriptural dictum that ‘ what is *known* is *asat* ’ (6th aphorism of Sivajnana Bodham). The world appears to be existent and vanishes soon. So the greatments say that it is *asat* (6th sutra, Sivajnana Siddhi). There are similar expressions. If such expressions are pointed out on illustrations, we shall give the proper meaning of those expressions in those places. So they are not contradictory.

The classification of maya

From what has been said above it will be seen that maya is the material cause of the universe, everlasting, insentient, pervaded by the Supreme Being, and is the energy capable of being used at will. It is also a real entity and is subtle in form. It is of two kinds, pure and impure. The pure maya is also known by the names mahamaya (mamayai in Tamil) Kutila, kundali and Bindhu. The pure maya is the material cause for the pure universe and the impure maya is the material cause for the impure universe.

The evolutes Siva or Nada etc., are pure whereas the evolutes kala etc., are impure. It may be questioned what is pure and what is impure. That which causes unmixed bliss alone is pure whereas all others are impure.

Suddha Maya (Pure maya)

It may be questioned what is the valid means of knowledge for the existence of pure maya. The following is the answer. It is accepted that the characteristic of the Supreme Being is to be the author of five cosmic functions. So it is obtained that He has three states which are respectively the causes for the suspended animation, subtle animation and gross animation of the cosmic world (laya, bhoga and adhikara). So there should be a locus for the immutable Supreme Being for assuming these three states. As the impure world cannot be the locus, the pure world is to be assumed to be the proper locus. The material cause for such a world is pure maya.

Also the scriptures state that Ananta Deva is the matured soul among the Vijñanakalas and Srikantha Rudra is the matured soul among the pralayakalas. Such persons have dispelled the innate mala and are omniscient by the grace of the Supreme Being. They have only the residue of mala for undertaking their respective duties and they create the effects of the impure maya. So they should possess embodiment and the corresponding bodily organs etc. The material cause for such embodiments etc., is the pure maya. It may be said that their embodiment etc., may be taken to be the effects of impure maya itself. But it is not proper. Impure maya produces delusion etc., and Ananta Deva, Srikantha and others should be deluded. But it is not so and pure effects cannot be produced from impure maya. Impure maya is a cause of obscuration only to the selves that have impure deeds and the Vijñanakalas have no such impure deeds and we shall give the valid means of knowledge of the existence of Vijñanakalas in the eight sutra. So the embodiments etc., of the Vijñanakalas cannot have their belongings caused from the impure maya.

Also it is accepted by all religionists that the determinate perception arises from a knowledge of the language, which is formed from letters. Pure maya is the material cause for such letters. This is another reason for holding the existence of the pure maya.

We have shown in the first aphorism that the letters of the language are perishable and that there is no effect without a cause.

If it be so, it may be questioned that as the ether which is the effect of the sound only (śabda tanmatra) is the only cause for all

sounds. It should be known that ether is the cause for the sound which manifests the sound of letters. It cannot be the cause for the literal sound. The sound produced from ether is something like the loudness which enables the hearer to hear the speech sound. It is something like the illumination which manifests the various forms and shapes of things. The sound produced by ether is the manifestor, whereas the literal sound is that which is manifested. So ether cannot be the material cause of the literal sound. The sound produced by the sea etc., are different from the literal sound. So the material causes for the two kinds of sounds should be different. The distinction between the literal or speech sound and its manifestor, the sound of ether, may be likened unto the conception among the logicians who hold that the pot and the potness which is the manifestor of the pot are different.

The distinction between the literal sound which is pronounced and the ordinary sound which enables the pronunciation to be heard must be noted from the following facts. Pronunciation takes place from the inner efforts such as the action of the vocal cord, the tongue, teeth etc., whereas the manifesting sound is produced by the external effort of intonation.

It may be said that ether itself may be taken to be the material cause for both the sounds. But this is inadequate for the following reason. There are evolutes such as ego, etc., which are subtler than ether and there are loci and living beings pertaining to such evolutes. Those living beings are in possession of determinate perception and determinate perception cannot be had unless a person is aware of the literal sound which is pronounced. So the literal sound is existent in the locus caused by a subtler evolute which is higher up in the ladder of evolvents than the sky. Hence it is not proper to ascribe a lower evolvent as the material cause for an effect which is existent in a subtler and a higher evolvent. For this reason even the Sankhyas should hold pure maya as the material cause for the literal sound. The evolute intellect is ascribed the function of determinate conception. It is no other than the awareness of a thing as this is Devadatta, this is black etc., which is the form of the determinate perception. So those who dwell in the locus of intellect should be in possession of what is called determinate perception.

Four kinds of speech

This literal sound is of four kinds subtle, gross, impression and the expression (suksma or para, pasyanti, madhyama and vaikari). These are the four states which are assumed by the literal sound in its development from cause to effect. This causes the determinate awareness and the causation may be called pure transformation of pure maya as in the case of cloth being made up into tent. These are attached to the five kalas and are in the form of five kinds in the pure tattvas, Nada etc.* The expression may further be classified as subtle and gross. The subtle being an utterance which is heard by one's own self and the gross being heard even by others. This way four kinds may themselves be classified into five kinds. There are some people who enumerate expressive as one and classify the subtle into two kinds namely the subtle and the subtlar.

Now it may be pointed out that the effects of pure maya, the five kalas and the five tattvas are not perceived by us whereas the literal sound is being perceived. It may be asked that if suddha maya is the material cause the literal sound should also be not perceived. The speech which is the literal sound is subtle without any adjunct among the evolutes of pure maya. The same thing is gross among the evolutes of impure maya and grosser still among the evolutes of prakrti because of the difference in its adjuncts. So from the nature of the adjuncts the literal sound is perceived by us. Again the speech is in the form of words and the evolutes are in the form of substances. So it is not proper to ascribe the same pure maya as the common material cause. So it is better to ascribe some other thing to be the material cause for the speech. If that be suggested even though there is difference between the evolutes and the speech, yet they belong to the same class of being pure. Also speech should depend upon the world of substances. So it is unnecessary to ascribe a different material cause other than pure maya to such a world of words. Thus the pure maya alone has got two natures one being the form of words and the other being the form of substance and so for the world of speech and substance the same pure maya will be held as the material cause.

The final view regarding the material cause

In the same manner, though the worlds differ in their nature in being pure and impure, they do not differ in their belonging to the

same class as being insentient effects. So it is unnecessary to ascribe two different material causes to suit both the pure and the impure worlds. It may be considered that maya is one, which has both the qualities purity and impurity, and is the material cause for both these worlds. In Sivajnana Siddhi it is said that maya proceeds from Bindu, and from maya avyakta comes (I sutra stanza 19). It is also said, in the second sutra stanza 50, that the subtle body is the first cause of the gross body and the first cause for the subtle body is what is called mahat (mula prakrti) and the first cause of mahat is mohini (impure maya) for which the first cause is Bindu (pure maya). In the ritualistic performance, if the five kalas of the pure maya are purified the various worlds in the impure maya are also purified. Also in Sivaprakasam the impure maya is said to be pervasive in its effects, this shows that impure maya is limited in its extent. Also impure maya is enumerated as an evolute as one of the effects even as prakrti maya is enumerated. Also suddha maya has three states, the gross, the subtle and the subtler, and these states are respectively called prakrti, impure maya and pure maya. So impure maya is the effect of pure maya. This is the view of some of the teachers.

There are others who hold a different view. They say that a view which holds the impure maya as the effect of pure maya is contradictory to the statement that occurs in the sixth chapter of Tiruvarutpayan. In that chapter the sixth stanza says that the Prime Being which is one, the selves that are many, the spiritual darkness, the deed, and the two mayas which make up six entities have no origin. It is also contradictory to similar scriptural texts.

In the first aphorism (Sivajnana Siddhi) the expression 'Vinduvīn mayai yaki' means the impure maya evolves in the form of effects, even as Vindu (pure maya). There the case ending *in* (இன்ற) expresses similarity. It does not express the shade that Bindu is the material cause. The 50th stanza (II sutra of Sivajnana Siddhi) expresses that subtle body etc., are pervasive in gross body etc. The expression in Sivaprakasam that impure maya is pervasive in its effects, implies that Ananta Deva is limited in his action to the region of impure maya. i.e., his action does not extend beyond kala. Also purity and impurity are contradictory. Pure maya manifests the intelligence of the individual self without causing delusion, and the impure maya while manifesting the intelligence causes delusion. So these two attributes which are contradictory cannot exist in the same thing.

Even though the evolute called purusa is enumerated along with the other evolutes yet it is known that it is not an evolute which is the effect of the impure maya. Likewise, impure maya is not an evolute of pure maya even though it is enumerated as one of the evolutes.

It is proper that the portion which is stirred by the Intelligence-potency of Ananta Deva should be enumerated as an evolute with the name maya even as that portion which is stirred by the consciousness—Force of the Prime Being of the pure maya is separately called as an evolute with the name Siva or Nada. The impure maya is pervaded by pure maya. So when the pure maya the pervasive is purified, the pervaded one also becomes purified. On that account it is not proper to hold the view that impure maya is an effect of pure maya. For these reasons there are other teachers that hold that the two mayas are different ones.

In *Ratnatraya* these two views are quoted as the views of others. It is said that both the mayas are eternal. If we assume that the two mayas are different, since all those things that are insentient and many should be effects, this view is contradictory to the reason. If the view is explained by saying that they are one when separately considered then the ground for the inference itself fails, for even among the pots, if each one is considered to be a single entity as red pot, green pot, black pot etc., then there is no case for considering the pots as many. Also we hold the Prime efficient cause to be one. So also the prime material cause of the universe must be one only. If we say that by purifying the pervasive ones the pervaded ones will also become purified, then all things must be pure in as much as the pervasive Lord Siva is always pure. Hence it is not proper to hold that purifying the pervasive one, the pervaded ones will consequently become purified.

That which causes pleasure alone is pure and that which causes pleasure mingled with pain is impure. So purity and impurity may not be held to be opposite qualities in as much as they belong to the same class with respect to the production of the effect or causing.

We take both intelligence and non-intelligence as the effective qualities of the evolute buddhi (Intellect). So they are not opposites. In the same manner the pure maya manifests the intelligence of a person without deluding him, whereas the impure maya manifests the intelligence of the self with delusion. So purity and impurity

belong to the same class, in as much as both of them enable the manifestation of the intelligence, and they are not the opposites. The dictum that the cause is pervasive in its effects implies that the qualities in the effects should not be considered to be the opposites of any quality of its cause. For these reasons a third set of teachers hold the view that maya is one, and it has two parts one part which remains unmixed with spiritual darkness and deed, and the other part mixed with them. That part which is unmixed is called pure maya and the other part is impure maya. These two parts have the common quality of yielding experience and revealing. Because of this in Sivajnana Siddhi and Sivaprakasam, maya is treated separately as pure and impure. But while enumerating the principles of bondage it is taken as one principle maya, when they enumerate the principles of bondage as five. They are the spiritual darkness, maya, deed, the effects of maya and the obscuring potency of the Lord (tirodam). This the third view is held to be the truth by many other teachers. Of these views the last one is most appropriate.

There are some who hold the following view. The inherent potencies of the supreme Being are of two kinds. One the cognitive and the other conative. The cognitive potency is called para, the supreme, and the conative potency is called the pure maya. The supreme Being will cognise the universe with its cognitive potency, and create it with the conative potency. They are inseparable from the prime Being and the prime Being cannot stand alone without them. Of these, if the supreme Being stands in the form of cognitive potency, it is called Siva. If it stands as conative potency alone it is called sakti. If both of them stand equally poised, it is called sadakhya. If the conative potency is predominant the Supreme is called Isvara, whereas if the cognitive potency is predominant it is called pure vidya. This is the intention behind the stanza 65 of the first sutra of Sivajnana Siddhi which deals with the three states of the supreme Being laya, bhoga and adhikara. Now it is improper to hold the pure maya as inherent potency. All the Saivagamas refer to pure maya as the potency used at will (parigraha sakti) and not as inherent potency. The inherent potency of the supreme Being will be sentient and not insentient. The conative potency is not contradictory to the cognitive potency in as much as both are intelligence. The stanza of siddhi define the three states of the supreme Being, referring to them as being identical with the locus which are evolutes by courtesy usage.

The effects of suddha maya

The effects of pure maya are of two kinds. They are the world of speech and the world of things. Of these, the world of speech was explained before while dealing with the four kinds of the speech sounds. The world of things is of two kinds : they are the pure evolutes and the kalas. The pure evolutes are five in number, Siva, Sakti, Sadasiva, Isvara and pure vidya. Their origin is herewith expounded.

The evolute of Siva

At the end of the great aeon the pure maya will involve all its effects and will be in the form of cause alone. The supreme Being also will be relieved of all kinds of manifestations of the will power and will remain by Himself. In order to produce the re-evolution He will think of the pure maya which is His body posing in the form of cognitive potency alone. As a result of this, the disturbed portion of the pure maya is called the evolute Siva, as it forms the locus for Siva in the form of pure cognitive potency. As it is in the form of absorption it is also called the evolute of absorption. It is also called formless because of its formless (Niskala) nature. As it is prone to become the effects it is also called the potential (Saktiman). As it is the support of the subtle among the four literal sounds, it is called the evolute subtle or Nada. The Lord who embodies it as locus is also called by these five names. This evolute Siva is the first pure transformation of the pure maya. It is the locus for the cognitive potency of the supreme Being and its ten different aspects, indika, dipika, rocika, mocika, urdhava kamini, vyapini, vyomarupa, ananta, anada, anasrta. It is also the locus of the Sivagamas in the form of the subtle (nada). There are those that get suitable initiation and worship the Lord of the form of Nada with a desire to experience the worlds and their objects pertaining to the evolute of Siva. They will be released from the residual effects of authority and will be in possession of the residual effects of the impurity in the form of subtle laya. This evolute is the locus of such released selves and the worlds and experiential contents in that evolute.

The evolute of Sakti

Then the supreme Being will stir further the evolute Siva in order that it may evolve further, with His conative potency. In conse-

quence, the pure maya assumes a second pure transformation which is called Sakti. It is so called because the supreme Being in the name of Sakti embodies it as His locus. As it is grosser than the former transformation (Siva), it is called the gross evolute laya. It is also called the gross formlessness (sthula niskala) as it is the support of the gross literal sound, it is also called the *gross* or *Bindu*. The supreme Being who embodies it is also known by these names. It is the locus for the conative potency of the supreme Being and its five manifestations, nivr̥tti, pratistha, vidya, santi and santyatita. It is also the locus of the Sivagamas of the form of the gross, pasyanti or Bindu. It is also the locus of the released souls who have worshipped the Supreme in the form of Bindu and have the residual effects of the impurity in the form of gross laya alone, and all the objects of their experiences.

The evolute of Sadasiva

The third pure transformation which is caused by the supreme Being with His cognitive potency and conative potency is called the evolute Sadasiva. The supreme Being stirs the pure maya specially both with His cognitive potency and conative potency. This evolute is called Sadasiva because it is embodied by the supreme Being in His aspect of Sadasiva. In this aspect the supreme Being is prone to activate so it is called the evolute of udyukta. It is also called the evolute of preservation (bhoga tattva) as it is held as the locus by the Supreme in His aspect of the preserving state.

It is also called the evolute of form and formlessness (sakala-niskala) for the Supreme that causes it is devoid of the phases of maya but is in possession of the phases of grace and also this evolute is common to both absorption and activation (pravṛtti and nivṛtti).

This evolute is the locus for the five aspects of the gracious energy which form the head etc., of the Lord Sadasiva. They are denoted by the Vedic spells Isana murddha, tatpuruṣa vaktra, aghora hrdaya, Vamadeva guhya and sadyojata murti. They are also named Isani, Purani, Artti, Vama and Murtti, which have respectively five phases, four phases, and eight phases, thirteen phases and eight phases respectively. It is also the locus of the three aspects of the energy which are named harini, janani and rodhayitri. It is also the place of all the Sivagamas in the form of the impression (madhyama) and to those

intelligent beings enumerated from pranava Siva etc., who are the chief cause for the division of the Sivagamas into twenty eight kinds from Kamika to Vatula. There are also released souls who are called anu Sadasivas. They have the residual impressions of experience and they are competent to enjoy the pure proximity. To such released souls and also to the elements of their embodiment, this evolute forms the locus. The elements of embodiment are usually numbered as four. They are body, instruments, locus and things experienced (Tanu, karana, bhuvana and bhoga).

The evolute of Isvara

From this third pure transformation originates the fourth pure transformation of the pure maya. The Supreme Being who has caused the third pure transformation assumes the state of authority and impels the pure maya with His energy of activity. Here the transformation assumes a subtle effect. This subtle effect is assumed as locus by the Supreme Being in the state of Isvara. So the evolute is also named as Isvara. It is also called as the evolute of subtle authority or subtle activity or subtle form (suksma niskala). It should be noted that the evolute is called by all the names that are used to indicate the Supreme Being which assumes it as His locus. This evolute forms the place for the Sivagamas which are in the form of subtle expression and the eight Isvaras of vidya of whom Ananta Deva is the foremost. It is also the locus for all those released souls called Rudras who had worshipped Ananta Deva etc., in order to attain their powerful states and to the four elements of their embodiment.

The evolute of pure vidya

The fifth pure transformation of pure maya is called pure vidya. This is caused by the supreme Being in the form of gross authority by stirring the fourth pure transformation with His intelligence-energy and activating it in a gross form. This is called pure vidya since it is assumed as locus by Anantesvara who is the cause for vidya. It is also called the gross evolute of Isvara. It is also known as the evolute of gross authority, gross activity and gross forms which are respectively the names of the supreme Being that assumes it as His locus. It is the place of gross Isvara and all the Sivagamas in the form of

gross expression and the spells which are numbered as seven crores. It is also the locus of the higher trinity, Indra etc., and the four elements of their embodiment. The trinity and Indra are those that control the trinity and Indra who live in the effects of prakṛti.

These five pure transformations of the pure maya have loci which are called bhuvanas which are respectively ten, five, one, eight and nine in number. These five transformations are respectively the locus, for the three states of the supreme Being namely absorption, preservation and authority. They are also the places of the released souls who have only the residual impressions of the impurity which impel the souls to have experiences of absorption, preservation and authority. They are supposed to have the experiences of bliss as they desire.

Some clarifications

It is said that there is no evolute of Time in pure maya. Without the element of Time, there can be no experience. But in the foregoing, the five evolutes are said to yield experiences to the released soul who have only the residual impressions of the spiritual impurity.

In pauskara this point has been clarified. When it is said that there is no evolute of time in pure maya, it should be understood that the element of Time which enables the released souls to have experience of the effects of pure maya is not impure as the evolute of Time that is in impure maya. So it should be understood that all the thirty-one evolutes from Time onwards upto earth are also to be found in pure maya, but they are pure yielding unmixed joy. These five evolutes Siva, Sakti, Sadasiva, Isvara and pure vidya are implied in the three states absorption, preservation and authority. So some Āgamas speak of three pure evolutes. Of these five the evolute Siva, Sakti and Sadasiva are assumed by pure Siva. So they are counted as one whereas Isvara and pure vidya are assumed as locus by Anantesa and others. So they are counted separately and the total of pure evolutes is numbered as three.

Some of the Āgamas count Isvara and pure vidya as one in as much as they are assumed as locus by deities which are dependent on pure Siva. They speak of four pure evolutes namely Siva, Sakti, Sadasiva and the locus of the dependent deity. Some of the Āgamas count as one both Siva and Sakti and enumerate Sadasiva etc., separa-

tely. According to them, the pure evolutes are only four. But there is no contradiction in numbering pure evolutes as five while giving the number in elaboration.

With this intention some Sivagamas speak of the three evolutes Siva, Sakti and Sadasiva as the locus of the Supreme Being for His three states, absorption, preservation and authority and they refer to the two evolutes Isvara and pure vidya as the locus of Anantesvara etc., who belong to the category of the individual selves having one or two spiritual impurities who are released from the impurity, but have residual impression of authority and perform the five cosmic functions according to the dictates of the supreme Being. In Sivaprakasam etc., it is said that the pure vidya originates from Isvara, Isvara originates from Sadasiva, Sadasiva originates from Sakti and Sakti originates from Siva. But the intention is that the pure transformation mentioned arise respectively from the pure transformation of the pure maya. Hence there is no contradiction. Here it may be questioned whether the effects of the pure maya are caused by the collection of causes or by successive building up or by transfiguration or by pure transformation or by mingled transformation by mix up.

The answer is as follows : The heap of sesame seeds or the heap of hairs of kavari used as fan are the examples of causation by collection of things. This means is adopted by some of the buddhists and the jains. Successive building up is advocated by the logicians and the classical example is the formation of the cloth from the cotton thread. These two modes are not suitable to the view of the Saiva siddhantin, for the causes are not many as in their cases. Curd is the effect of milk. There we cannot speak of these modes of causation. So these two modes are applicable only in certain limited cases. Again transfiguration like the appearance of snake from the rope and water from mirage is advocated by mayavadins. It will lead us to void or nothingness.

Of the two remaining modes of causation the mingled transformation by mix up like the curd which is formed by mixing up the butter milk with milk is suitable to impure maya alone, which is mixed up with the spiritual impurity and the deed. So pure transformation alone can be ascribed to the effects of pure maya which is not mixed up with anything. The classical example of pure transformation is the forming of the tent from the cloth.

There are some who view the pure transformation as a subtle form of mingled transformation by mix up. All the effects of the impure maya are got as a result of mingled transformation by mix up.

The five phases

The potency of Siva is one only ; but it receives several names according as it functions with respect to the release of the bondage of the individual self. Thus it has five names, Release, installation, wisdom, peace and the transcendent (Nivrtti, pratistha, vidya, Santi and Santyatita) according as it releases the self from its bondage, installs it so that it may not relapse into bondage, causes experiential wisdom other than those gained by inference or verbal testimony, removes the painful agitations like desire, hatred, will etc., and enables the self to enjoy supreme solace. These are called the five phases (kalas) of the potency of Siva. These five phases of the divine potency dwell in pure Maya as loci and the consequent transformations that take place in pure maya are also called by the same nomenclature. Siva who espouses these phase is called the Lord of relase, Lord of installation (Nivrttipati, pratisthapati) etc. respectively.

These five phases and the loci of the same denominations in the evolute of Sakti are different ; but since they are known by the identical names, it is for some to speak both of them as being identical.

Those who live on earth may meditate on these five phases in the form of the five elements, earth, water, fire, air and ether and thus enjoy the fruits of the actual realisation by meditation.

Thus the effects of pure maya have been in a way explained.

Impure maya

Impure maya may be defined as a real existent, everlasting and insentient one. It causes its effects from Kala to earth and is pervasive. It is the support of the deed and is formless, deluding the selves bounded by deeds in a general way unlike anava which deludes them specially. If it be so, it may be questioned how is it that the effects have form while the cause is formless, as it is a general principle that what is not in the cause will not appear in its effects. The question is not a proper one. When we say that impure maya is

formless we mean that the forms which are manifest in the effects are supposed to exist in the cause also in a subtle and unmanifest form. The terms form and formless are not contradictory. The term formless is used to describe the causes, the effects of which possess forms. The term subtle or formless is not used to describe the Supreme Being etc. It should be noted that Sivaprakasam describes the Supreme Being as being devoid of form and formlessness (Stn. 1 part 1). Sivajana siddhi, while giving the description of the individual self in stanza 20 of the fourth sutra uses the expression, that the individual self is not pervasive and imperceptible in the sense these expressions are used to describe the Supreme Being, which is all-pervasive and which cannot be deemed to be insentient in any sense (acittaru vyapakampol vyapakam aruvam inray).

In the first sutra of Sivajana Siddhi, Stn. 28 it is said that, 'formlessness cannot yield the form' and is answered by the citation that 'the ether which is formless yield the elements air and others'. Here the objection raised is by the mayavadin and the objection is refuted in accordance with his own tradition.

Hereafter the effects of the impure maya are dealt with :—

Effects of Impure maya

The potency of Ananta Deva stirs impure maya. The stirred portion of the impure maya is held to be one of the seven evolutes which go by the name vidya tattvas. From maya originate the evolutes of Time, Niyati and Kala respectively and from Kala emerge Vidya and from Vidya emerge Ragha.

The evolute of Time (Kala)

Of these, the evolute of time provides the time restriction of the experiences of the individual selves, which proceed towards worldly experiences after having their powers of volition, cognition and conation awakened by the addition of the evolutes Kala, Vidya and Ragha respectively.

The evolute of Time originated before the origination of the three evolutes kala, vidya and ragha. So it is inconsistent to say that Time aids the individual self only after the aids given by kala etc. Though

it is a *prima facie* view, yet on deeper consideration the consistency will be understood as follows.

Kala etc., directly aid the subject namely the individual self by manifesting its volitional, cognitive and conative potencies, but Time and order (Niyati) aid the individual self indirectly by restricting the experience and ordering it. Unless there is the awakening of the potencies of the individual self, there is no connection between the individual self and its deeds. So the help that is rendered by Time and order follows those that were rendered by kala etc.

If it be so, it may be proposed that the origin of Time and order may be placed after the origin of kala, vidya and raga. It may also be said that there is no valid means for determining the antecedence of the origin of Time and order. But on deeper consideration, it is seen that Time is a factor in the origination of all the effects. So the origin of kala, Niyati and raga also require the presence of the evolute of Time. Hence it is proper that the origin of Time should precede the origin of kala etc. If it be so, it may be argued since Time itself is an effect, the origin of Time should require some other temporal principle for its origin. The question is a proper one. We have posited the existence of pure Time for the origination of the effects of pure maya. That pure Time is the temporal principle for the origin of the impure Time as well as the activities of Ananta Deva who stirs the impure maya and uses His authority.

If it be so the pure Time itself may be taken to be the temporal principle which is required for all the effects; it is unnecessary to posit the existence of the impure Time. If it be said so, we have to reply that pure Time cannot be the cause for the effects of the impure maya. So it is necessary that we should posit the existence of impure Time. Again on the same basis it may be argued that since impure Time itself is an impure effect, to produce an impure Time, pure Time may not be the cause. If it be said so, we have to answer that the Time impure and the Time pure has got the class identity of being temporal factors so it is to be held correct that pure Time can be the instrumental cause for effecting the origin of the impure Time. It was established before that there are evolutes from pure maya which transcend the evolute pure Time onwards. Also when the whole universe is involved the Supreme Being is attributed to be engaged in doing five cosmic functions which are described as being subtle. For

these effects, that is, the five evolutes of the pure maya and the subtle cosmic functions performed by the Supreme Being, there seems to be no temporal factor. So it is inconsistent to say that Time is a necessary condition for all the actions which go under the term effect.

The consistency of the scheme may be understood as follows. Ananta Deva and others are acting within Time. But God transcends the limitations of Time and in fact. He is the Time of time. He does not require the aid of the time for His action. So He himself stands in the form of time by espousing the potency which is named kalayitri. He should suppose that for all effects produced by the individual selves Time is necessarily an instrument and not to the actions of the Supreme Being.

With this intention the author of the secondary Sivajnana Siddhi has said that pure evolutes are the independent forms of Lord Siva and they are said to be eternal as they transcend Time, but the order of those evolutes are given only with respect to their actions and not with respect to the factor of Time.

The rationale for the origin of the evolute order (Niyati) after the origin of Time is as follows. Its action actually takes place after the actions of kala, vidya and raga. But even the actions of kala etc., are to be ordained according to the deeds of the individual self and this is done by the evolute order. So its origin is placed before the origin of kala etc., and after the origin of Time. Though Time comes first according to the origin, yet when we consider the action of the evolute kala acts first. So while enumerating the evolutes of asuddha maya it is said that kala is the first and the earth is the last (kalaiyadi mannandam).

This distinction is not considered by some people and they mistake from such expressions as these that kala is the evolute that originates from impure maya at first. If it be so it may be argued that as per origin the order of the evolute is Time, order, kala, vidya and raga and according to the order of the action they should be mentioned in the order kala, vidya raga, Time and order. But in Sivaprakasam it is said that the evolutes kala, Time and order along with vidya and raga originate from impure maya. Here Time and order are placed after the origin of kala. What is the rationale for this? It may be asked.

Some people answer as it is mentioned in a verse the strict order need not have been followed. But it is not so. Here the author wished to point out that Sanskrit Tattva prakasika says that kala being acted upon by Time and order as its instrumental cause originates vidya raga etc., as their material cause. This is the intention of the author of Sivaprakasam in mentioning the evolutes in the order kala along with Time and order, vidya, raga etc. Even in the upagama Mrgendra the same order is observed.

Here the author of Sivaprakasam uses the preposition with while mentioning the origin of these evolutes. His exact wording is Kala along with Time and order, vidya and raga have their origin in impure maya. Here the intention of the author is that maya is the original material cause for all these evolutes. His intention is not to say that all these evolutes simultaneously take their origin in maya but in succession.

The commentator uses this context in order to explain some of the expressions of Sivajnana Siddhi the secondary so that there may be a consistency in the philosophic thought of Saiva siddhanta. In Sivajnana Siddhi it is said that the linguistic element of expression etc., come out of Bindu, the pure maya. The impure maya forms the origin of the evolute raga etc., and prakrti which is also called the root (mulam) is the first cause in the creation of the evolute of three-fold qualities etc.

Though the pure maya is the immediate cause of the linguistic element of subtle (suksma) yet the gross, the impression and the expression are said to originate from Bindu because of their successive origination. Maya is the direct material cause for Time, for the rest of the evolutes mentioned it is the cause for their succession. Prakrti is the direct cause of the three-fold quality. It is the cause in succession for the other evolutes. Succession is indicated in either of the two ways, the order of evolution and the order of involution.

The expressions raga etc. and the expression etc., (vaikariyadi) are mentioned in the order of involution. So there is no inconsistency in all the expressions of the canonical texts.

Let it be so. But the Buddhists and others will deny the existence of a thing like Time. So it may be asked what the valid means of knowing the existence of Time is. We shall answer the question.

Take for example a pot that is being created in the present time. We have to accept even though all the accessories like the wheel etc. were present, the past moment owing to the absence of one factor the pot could not be produced for the potter, wheel and mud etc. were all present, but the effect, the pot, was not produced. Here the syllogistic inference is as follows :—If an effect is not produced when all the known causal factors are present, it should be inferred that the non-production is due to the absence of a causal factor which is other than those that are present. This is like the non-production of a piece of cloth when all the accessories shuttle etc. are present, and the producer or the cotton thread is absent. That causal factor which was not present in the case of the non-production of the pot is the factor of Time. It may be said that the cause for the non-production is the deed : but it is not so, because even the deed cannot be the cause for the production, unless it is aided by Time. If this be denied, then pose the counter question why a man does not get the experience of the celestial world as soon as he has performed the sacrifice etc.

Also we see the tender leaves of the mango only in the spring season ; the flower jasmine (mullai) blossoms in the rainy season alone. Even the destruction of things takes place only when the appropriate time comes. If there be no factor of time, things should be produced at all times and they should have their ends immediately after they are being produced. We do not see this to occur. The fruits of an action takes its own time to manifest. Also we express ourselves by saying that things have their origin in a particular moment and their destruction at another moment. The cause for all these experiences and their expressions is time and its existence is clearly grasped by us.

Now the logicians will base the existence of time on our expressions like before and after. These expressions have no other cause and the only cause for such expressions is time and from this the existence of time is to be concluded, so they will say. They admit that time is one. Then it is not consistent that the time which is one only should be expressed in many ways. So they should say that the concept of time is combined or projected artificially with the movement of the sun etc. and so it is counted as many. In that case the awareness of after and before and the consequent expressions are to be admitted to have been caused by the movement of the heavenly bodies like the sun, and their reasoning fails to establish the existence of time.

Similarly they will try to establish the existence of direction by considering the expression which is used to denote front and back. By similar arguments, their proof for existence of direction also is refuted.

Note : In Tamil the terms 'mun' and 'pin' are used in two senses, one with reference to time and the other with reference to place. When they are used in the temporal sense they respectively mean before and after, and when they are used in spatial sense they mean 'front' and 'back' respectively.

The usage of expressions 'front' and 'back' are due to the existence of parts of earth, sky etc., and not to the existence of an entity called direction as the Naiyayikas and Vaisesikas assert. The same place is called to be in front of another place, or at the back of another place, or to the east or west of a certain place, and thus enable to understand the thought of the speaker. These usages are expressed relative to other places and it is not because there is an entity called direction.

The same argument may be advanced with respect to the entity of Time also. There is only one time ; the same point of time will be said to be past with respect to another time, present and future with respect to other points of time, so it may be argued that there is no valid reason to assume the plurality of time. Of course the plurality of time cannot be established by referring it to the different moments. But it can be established since the tenses are used with respect to a single action as is expounded hereafter.

Objection : Naiyayikas and others refer to Time as one, eternal and all pervasive ; you refute that view and say that it is many, finite and perishable. I want to know how it is to answer :

If time is one the actions like walking etc., should also be one without the difference of being past, present or future. But all the actions differ with respect to Time like past, present or future. This division or difference in the actions is caused by the division or difference in Time. So it will be understood that Time is many. But it may be objected to by saying that the action like walking etc., differ as past, present and future by their inherent nature. They need not be taken to differ artificially owing to the difference in Time. If it be said so, then the answer is as follows. By inherent nature the

action of walking is one only. For such an action to become many is artificial. If it is asserted that such a difference is a natural one, then it will follow that actions like walking etc., are the only cause for the awareness of past, present and future and for their usage. But the existence of Time is established on the basis of the awareness of the past, present and future and their usage. So the existence of Time cannot be established. Hence even for those that believe in the unity of Time the past, present and future of things must be established only on the difference of Time as past, present and future.

If it be so, it is admissible that the difference as past, present and future of the actions is due to the difference in the division of Time. Even if it be so, the division of Time as the past, present and future depends on the movements of the heavenly bodies such as the Sun and hence the division in Time is artificial and it should be held that in Nature Time is one. What is wrong in having such a conception of Time, it may be asked ?

It is not so. Even the movements of the heavenly bodies like, Sun are not different from actions. So their divisions as being past, present or future will not take place without corresponding divisions in Time. If it be asserted that such a division may take place independent of Time, it will lead to the fallacy called mutual dependence that has been shown already.

Among the divisions of Time some depend upon the movements of the heavenly bodies like the Sun. They are hour, minute, day, night, month etc. But there are certain division which are independent of the movements of the Sun etc. When we say that a pot was broken, the past, present and future tense of the actions do not depend upon the movements of the heavenly bodies. They are independent and their dependence must be attributed to the divisions of the evolute Time as past, present and future. Such a time should necessarily be taken as many and not one.

Objection may be raised in the following manner also. The difference in the usage of Time as past, present and future is due to the nature of things. They need not be attributed to the divisions in the evolute of Time itself. This is the view of the Buddhists and others who do not believe in the existence of Time.

Also if the divisions past, present and future are attributed to the nature of things, as the nature of things is inseparable from the thing itself, these three divisions should occur simultaneously. Also many qualities which are contradictory cannot be the attributes of the same thing. Hence the objection is inadmissible. Now the question of contradictory nature of attributes of a thing may be considered. It is generally said that contradictory attributes cannot be ascribed to the same thing. But in the case of the internal organ intellect (buddhi) the contradictory disposition dharma, adharma etc., are ascribed and for primal matrix prakṛti the three qualities sattva, rajasa and tamasa are attributed. Hence a clarification with respect to these things is essential. In the matter of disposition dharma etc., they are not contradictory. They are the effects of the intellect and are special cases of enlightenment that occurs in the evolute. There the word ajñāna does not mean the absence of enlightenment. It only means erroneous enlightenment. Even in the cases of qualities satvika is not contradictory to tamasa. That which enables a person to know a thing as it is, is satvika. That which makes a person know it otherwise is tamasa. Both of them make a person to know. There is no contradiction in causing the knowledge.

Now the objection may be raised as follows. The same Time is spoken of as the past one with reference to a pot that was broken, is referred to as present with reference to another pot, which is being broken. It is also referred to as future with reference to a pot that will be broken. So the same Time is spoken of as past, present and future, but there is no change in the Time. So is it not improper to attribute multiplicity to the Time simply because of the variation in the usage of Time as past, present and future. Here we shall offer an explanation. The same person is called the son with respect to his father. He is referred to as father with reference to his son. A person is called a giant with reference to a dwarf with respect to a greater giant. Similarly with reference to different things the same Time may be referred to differently as past, present and future. There it is clear that the Time is one. But with reference to the same thing pot. Time is said to be past, present and future. These divisions are different and they are perceptible. With reference to this perception it is proper to say that Time is many. In this manner Time is shown to be many as past, present, etc., and since it is also insentient, it is

to be inferred that it is perishable. Since it is perishable, it is clear that it should be limited in space.

The eternal verities such as God cannot be proved to be eternal unless they are comprehended as being supported by the eternal time. If such a Time is held to be perishable then it will be impossible to establish anything as eternal. This is a very good argument but if one questions how Time is established to be eternal, then naturally the answer will be Time itself has for its support another Time which is eternal. But this is an argument vitiated by the fallacy of depending on oneself (atmasrayah). If it be said that the Time depends upon another Time, which is eternal this answer leads to the fallacy which is called infinite regress. So it is not proper to establish the eternity of a thing by relating it to the support of an eternal Time. So eternity should be defined as transcendence of Time. Since the definition of eternity is this, there is no defect in conceiving Time as being non eternal. With respect to the three tenses the following objection may be raised. The past and future are comprehended. In between them it is very difficult to perceive a moment which is called the present. Even supposing that moment is conceived, the conception of the moment will take only in the past as the moment is passed away when conceived. So it is better to omit the present and admit only the past and future. The question is answered in the following manner. Even though the subtle present is not clearly conceived, the gross present is clearly objectified. So it is proper to hold all the three divisions of the Time.

Now the question may be raised as to what the gross present is. In satkarya vada the effect is not different from its material cause. In between the two states when the pot is in the form of clay and when it becomes destroyed in the form of potsherd the pot has the state in which it is used to carry water etc. The form of the pot becomes patent only between the two times. The gross present time is that when the pot is patent and is useful in carrying water. Hence it is to be understood that the Time which enables a pot to have three states is divided into three divisions the past, present and future. The three states are the causal state and the state of manifestation and the state in which the form of the pot is not perceived. The state in which the form of the pot is manifested and is used for the intended purposes is the gross present. Thus the nature of the evolute of Time has been briefly expounded.

The evolute of Niyati or Destiny

The individual selves which have their powers of volition, cognition, conation revealed by the evolutes kala, vidya and raga respectively begin to experience the worldly things. Generally they like the experiences of pleasures and dislike the experiences which painful. So it is natural for them to appropriate the good deeds belonging to other selves and reject the evil deeds belonging to themselves. It is the function of the evolute destiny to prevent such a tendency on the part of the individual selves and to direct them so as to experience the pleasures and pains that are due to them according to their deeds. It is some thing like the authority of a king who rules over his subjects. The terms niyati, pal, ul, deyvam, vidhi are synonyms.

Here the following objection may be raised. The fruits of the funeral ceremony celebrated by the sons are enjoyed by the parents. The birth ceremony which is done by the parent gives its fruits to the son. The fruits of cultivation performed by the labourer on farm field go to the owner of the field. The fruits of the sacrificial rites performed by a well-versed brahmin reach the person who causes the sacrifice to be performed. Hence the invariable concomittance that the fruits of an action reaches the doer of the action is not to be seen. Hence the evolute of destiny which is established on the basis of this invariable concomittance does not follow. But this is not so, for there is a relationship between the son and the father. So the fruits of action done by the son for the benefit of the father will go to the father and the fruits of the action done by the father with a view to the well being of the son reaches the son. Even in the case of the labourer he takes the wages. So the fruits of his action goes to the owner of the land and the sacrificial agent receives his due from the master of the sacrifice who causes him to perform the sacrifice on his behalf. So the fruits of the agent's action go to the master who causes the action. This way unless there is some nexus between the doer and the enjoyer we do not see in any case that the fruits of action done by one person going to another person. Hence there is no exception to the concomittance. So we have to confirm the existence of the evolute destiny which prevents one from enjoying the fruits of another's action. Unless there is the impartial governmental authority a weak person's possessions will be enjoyed by a strong person by forceful means. Similarly unless there is the evolute of destiny the fruits

of the action of one's self will be forcefully taken by other self and enjoy. By this example also the existence of destiny can be clearly perceived. If it be so it may be argued that in those cases the actions or the deeds of the individual will suffice. There is no need for establishing an evolute called destiny.

The deeds of a person will only yield the appropriate experience. They will not direct that experience to reach the doer of deeds. If it be said that they can even direct the experience, then there should be no instrumental causes and even the embodiment should be unnecessary for the experience of pleasure or pain which is the result of the deeds. But if the embodiment and the other things are needed as instrumental causes for the experience of the results of the deed, the evolute destiny also is likewise required as the instrumental cause. Hence the deeds alone without the evolute called destiny cannot direct the individual souls to experience the fruits of their actions. If it be so, then it may be argued that the admission of an evolute called destiny is unnecessary in as much as it is only the potency of the Lord, his authority that directs the experiences of the individual self and limits the experiences to the performance of their deeds. Well said, the potency of the Lord will function only through the instruments not without them. If it is admitted that it can function directly, then all individual selves should get liberation without the need of other requirements since it is not so, it is clear that the potency of the Lord functions only through the instruments through which the potency of the Lord functions, is the evolute destiny.

The evolute of Kala

The function of kala is to remove partly the screening power of the spiritual impurity called mala and reveal the volitional potency of the individual self. The individual self is supposed to be enshrouded by mala and exists like void, before the advent of kala. As the root meaning of kala is removal and direction and as it removes partly the screening power of the spiritual impurity. Hence it is called kala.

As spiritual impurity is all pervasive the sense of removal of its screening power should be taken to be similar to the preventive action of the philosophers' stone. The philosophers' stone prevents the heating power of fire from acting on anything that is in contact with

it. In the same manner kala prevents the screening power of the individual self. Partial removal means the removal of the screening power with respect to the objects of the intellect which operates under the constraints of the deeds of the individual.

If it be so in all cases where experience of pleasure and pain occur according to the limitations imposed by the deeds of a person the activity of the intellect is necessary. As it is necessary the activity of intellect alone is essential why should the activity of kala also be imposed unnecessarily. Objection may be raised in this form. The answer is even the intellect is inert and it cannot act by itself unless it is acted upon by the volitional potency of the individual self. So the potency of the individual self which is enshrouded by mala should require an instrument for making it manifest. That instrument which removes the screening power of the mala and directs the volitional power of the individual self towards the intellect is kala. Hence the necessity of its presence will be appreciated.

If it be so then a doubt may arise in the following manner. The potency of the Lord is sentient, so it may be taken that the potency of the Lord directs and activates the intellect, which is inert. But this idea is a wrong one, for even the internal organs becomes active like the gross organism only when they are activated by the potency of the individual self. If that restriction is not admitted then the gross body of the potter which is always activated by the potency of the Lord which is all pervasive, should produce the pot even without the activation by the potency of the individual self of the potter. It is not so. So it should be admitted that in all cases the inert evolutes become active only when activated by the individual self. If it be so, then the following objection may be raised. Even the evolute kala is inert. It should require some other evolute to activate it. What that evolute is? That evolute is collectively called the directing evolutes which are five in number namely Siva, Sakti, Sadakya, Isvara and pure Vidya. In a work on Siddhanta Tugalaru Bodham, it is said that the evolutes suddha vidya etc., activate the seven tattvas by assuming inseparable union with them.

Even Sivajnana Siddhi in stanza 70 of the second sutra refers to the pure evolutes as directive principles. On the basis of these two verbal testimony it should be known that the directive principles preraka karuvi or the pure evolutes which are activated by the potency of Lord and by these directive principles kala etc., are activated.

In that case it may be further questioned what is wrong in admitting the pure evolutes themselves as directive principles with respect to internal organ intellect etc. Why should an extraneous group called experiential principles be brought in between them? The proper answer is that pure evolutes cannot become the instruments of activation for the individual selves which are enshrouded by mala, which is indicated by the term pasutva. This equally applies to vidya and raga. This kala is only an instrument for the activities of the individual self. But as it is inseparably attached to the individual self in all its experiential activities by manifesting its volitional potency, it is referred to as the agent. This means that kala is in inseparable togetherness with the individual self in all its experiential activities.

The evolute Vidya

We have said that with the help of kala the individual self has its volitional potency manifested and becomes the agent. For such individual self vidya takes its origin from kala and manifests the cognitive potency of the individual self and is being activated by it and becomes the instruments for the experiential perception and the indeterminate perception. In the experiential perception it is the intellect that becomes the internal object and the intellect is the instrument in the case of the determinate perception where the object is an external thing like the pot. The same vidya is the instrument for perceiving external objects in an indeterminate manner since it is not conjoined with intellect. The same vidya is the instrument for the cognition of the separate activities of mind, intellect and ego, which are respectively the proposal, the determination and identification.

It may be objected to by saying that kala alone is necessary in as much as it removes the screening power of the spiritual imperfection and enlightens the individual self. In addition to kala to speak of the existence of vidya to manifest the cognitive potency of the individual self is unnecessary, for the removal of the screening power of the spiritual imperfection itself involves the manifestation of the cognitive potency in addition to the volitional potency.

In the case of blindness as soon as the cataract is removed the eye is not fully prepared for objectifying the external things. It cannot have the definite cognition of the external thing. In the same manner

owing to the presence of kala the screening power of mala may be removed and the cognitive potency of the individual self may partly become manifest, but the potency cannot become attached to the intellect and have the determinate perception. In order to direct the cognitive potency of the individual self to become attached to the internal organ intellect it is only the vidya which has its origin from kala is the instrument. Hence the necessity for its existence.

Again it may be argued that kala alone will be able to remove the screening power of the mala and also to direct the cognitive power of the individual self to become attached to the internal organ intellect. But here we have to understand a principle which being followed in positing the existence of the evolutes. That principle is each evolute will function in a particular way only. Two functions cannot be attributed to the same evolute. But still as the two functions viz., the removal of the obscuring power of mala and the direction of the cognitive power of the self are to take place simultaneously. So it is held that kala which has its origin from removes the obscuration and vidya which originates from kala directs the cognitive potency of the self towards the internal organ intellect. Hence it should be understood kala which is the instrument in removing obscuring power of mala, modifies itself in a part of it as vidya and objectifies the object that is manifest in the intellect. It is because of this, vidya has been said to originate from kala and not from maya.

In the same manner the origin and the function of other evolutes also may be understood not only from the verbal testimony but also from the valid inferential reasoning our object in the commentary is to indicate such fine points in a brief manner.

Here some elucidation may be required to understand the intellect, which itself objectifies external things as an object of self and the instrument in objectifying the intellect is vidya. For indeterminate perception and for determinate perception the instruments are the five sense organs and the internal organs respectively. The object for these perceptions is the external one like sandal paste, garland of flowers etc. For the experiential perception which follows the determinate perception, the external things like sandal paste and garland of flowers cannot be the objects, for sandal paste and garland of flowers are only aids to experience and they are not the objects of experience. For experiential perception experience alone is the object. If it be

questioned what is the object of that perception, the answer is that the intellect which is modified by the definite perception of the external object sandal paste and garland of flowers etc., is the object. The intellect becomes modified into one of the three kinds of qualities sattva, rajasa and tamasa according as the external object is one of those qualities. It is only the intellect which is in the form of sentience that is experienced as pleasure, pain, or indifference. Since it is so, the intellect which is modified according as it contacts the external objects, should become the object of the cognitive potency of the individual self in the case of experiential perception. The instruments through which the cognitive potency objectifies the modified intellect is vidya.

In Sivaprakasam the stanza 27 of the general division expresses this idea in the following expression. The evolute vidya stands between the individual self and the intellect and enables the impressions of the external object which are reflected in the intellect to reach the individual self as an object. If it be objected by saying that such an instrument may be taken to be mind itself, one of the internal organs, it will be explained at the end of this topic how it is inadmissible. If it be so, it may be questioned that such an instrument may be assumed to be the cognitive potency of the individual self itself. It is not so. The conscious potency of the individual self by its nature will experience the supreme bliss. So to have the experience which can be expressed in words such as 'I experience pleasure, I experience pain etc.,' is only artificial. So even those who assume the conscious potency of the individual to be the instrument should say that it is the instrument in combination with the evolute vidya. Hence the evolute vidya which becomes a necessity even in that case is to be taken as such an instrument. If it be so it is admissible that vidya is the instrument in the case of the experiential perception where the modification of the intellect is perceived. How is it that it is instrumental even in the case of indeterminate perception? This will be answered as follows :

Determinate perception is one in which the external object is determined with respect to its name, class (jati) etc. This determinate perception cannot occur unless the external object is known generally in an indefinite manner. So it can be concluded that there is an indeterminate perception or sensation of the object where our attention is drawn to it. Since it is concluded, there should be an instru-

ment to produce the knowledge of that indeterminate perception. The sense organ eye, ear etc., are the instruments which sense organs are activated by the individual self they cannot become the instruments of the indeterminate perception. So the instrument which enables the individual self to activate the sense organ in the case of sensation or indeterminate perception is to be owned as the evolute vidya.

If it be questioned that why intellect cannot be taken to be the instrument for activating the sense organs, the answer is as follows : the intellect is the determining instrument as to the definiteness of a perception. If that intellect is taken to be the instrument, then even the indeterminate perception will become determinate perception. So the intellect cannot be the instrument there. The reason for the division of perception as indeterminate and determinate is only the absence and the presence of the intellect in perceiving the external object.

Let it be so. It has been held that the evolute of vidya is the instrument in knowing the functions of the internal organs intellect ego and mind also. The function of the intellect is taken to be the determination, the function of ego, is taken to be identification and that of the mind is manifold proposals. Why can't we take the internal organs themselves as the instrument even in that case? The answer is that they cannot be taken as instruments, because intellect etc., are intelligent with respect to their objects. They are not intelligent with respect to the evolutes that objectify them. Their actions are limited to the things that they objectify. They cannot extend beyond them. Thus it should be conceived that the evolute vidya is the instrument in which all kinds of awareness are objectified by the individual selves.

The evolute Raga

Since there can be no experience for the individual self unless its conative potency becomes manifested the individual self whose cognitive potency is made manifest by the activity of vidya. The instrument that has its origin from vidya and makes manifest the conative potency of the individual self is raga. It is the instrument that causes the activity of the disposition of the intellect which is named as attachment. Since conation is a special kind of cognition, the evolute raga which makes manifest the conative potency should be the modification

of vidya is in the fitness of things. Sivajnana Siddhi the secondary also says that raga has its origin from vidya. Hence the assertion in the Pauskra that raga has its origin from kala should be taken to have been said with respect to its succession as in the case of the dictum of Sivaprakasam which says, that kala, time, necessity along with vidya and raga have their origin from maya. But there are people who hold that raga has its origin in kala itself. They will interpret the saying of the Siddhi 'vicchaiyin aragam tonri' to mean that raga has its origin in kala even as vidya. For them the particle 'in' in that expression is a particle indicating similarity. They do not take it as a preposition 'from'.

If it be so, the following objections may be raised. For the manifestation of the conative potency the raga or attachment in the intellect itself is enough ; to suppose the existence of a separate evolute raga is not warranted. But it is not so. The conative potency of the individual self should first of all activate intellect and then alone the disposition attachment in the intellect will be active. So to say that such an attachment of the intellect will manifest the conative potency of the individual self which will cause its own origin is not proper. Hence it is to be supposed that the evolute raga will be the cause of the activity of the disposition in the intellect through manifesting the conative potency of the individual self.

If it is so again it may be objected to by saying that the evolute raga is itself sufficient. As there is no use for the disposition attachment which is supposed to be in the intellect is not warranted. But it is not so. The evolute raga will manifest the conative potency of the individual self in the general manner even as the cognitive potency is made manifest by the evolute of vidya. It will not cause desire in a special manner so as to extend to all the external objects. If we don't suppose that there is a special manifestation of desire, one should desire all the objects at a particular time and the same desire should be satiated simultaneously at another time. But this is not the case in actual experience. So desire is manifested in a general manner with the aid of raga and the same desire is caused specially by the disposition attachment in the intellect. So both are necessary.

As an alternative the following suggestion may be made. It is not necessary to hold the existence of the evolute raga, nor is it necessary to admit the existence of attachment in the intellect. All the

objects of the world are originated in succession from the three qualities and so they will exist in one of the three forms namely the form of pleasure, the form of pain and the form that induces apathy or indifference. So the same form of pleasure may be supposed to excite desire in a general as well as special manner and will cause experience. What is wrong in this supposition? Unless there is a speciality in the case of persons who desire all things must become objects of desire for all selves simultaneously, for they do not differ from being of the form of pleasure. But we don't see this.

Also a person should persist in the experience of a thing experience without any aversion to it. But we see persons who get detached from the objects after experiencing them and having no more desire towards the same thing. Hence it is wrong to suppose that the form of pleasure of a thing is the cause for the desire of the person.

The objection may be raised in the following manner. Even those who accept the evolute raga in addition to the indisposition attachment in the internal organ intellect conceive it to be together with the individual self even like kala and vidya. In that case all the individual selves will continue to be attached to the pleasurable objects and there will be no satiation. This objection cannot hold good. Raga is of two kinds. One is of the form of sentience and the other is of the form of residual impressions. Of these two raga of the form of sentience is the disposition contained by the intellect and it is only that raga will act with respect to the external object. When that raga ceases there will be no desire to enjoy that object. So it is possible that there will be satiation with respect to a particular object of pleasure. Even though the evolute raga which is of the form of residual impression continues to be adhered to the individual self unless there is the special attachment acting as a cause, it will not cause the effect.

Also if the evolute raga which is of the form of residual impression ceases to act, there will be no desire on the part of the individual self with respect to any other object. Since it does not cease to act, it will always be in togetherness with the individual self. This evolute raga will cease to act in the state of release by the action of the initiation called the purification of the adhavas. In that case there will be no desire on the part of the individual self towards the object of experiences in a general form. In that case the supreme desire of Lord

Siva will arise in its place and make the conative potency of the individual self to become manifest in all the aspirations that will lead to the supreme bliss.

So far it is good. Is it necessary to admit an evolute of aversion in order to manifest aversion towards the worldly objects even like the evolute raga which manifests the quality of desire on the part of the individual self. The answer is that it is not necessary, for there is no potency of aversion attributed to the individual self even as the conative potency. The aversion which is caused towards the external objects will be caused only by the disposition of detachment that is posited to be in the intellect.

If it be so, it may be questioned what is wrong in assuming that there is a potency of aversion on the part of the individual self similar to the conative potency and in order to make that potency manifest. The following is the answer :

There is no valid reason to assume that there is a potency of aversion on the part of the individual self besides the conative potency. Though there is no need to suppose that there is an evolute of aversion to make that potency manifest, the aversion towards external objects is caused only by the disposition of the intellect which is called aversion. But it may be questioned what is the valid means in assuming the evolute of raga and also the eight dispositions of the intellect.

The answer is as follows. The disposition of attachment of the internal organ intellect will not be caused unless the knowledge that an object is the cause for pleasure, another object is cause for pain, and so on, arises. That knowledge of the specific nature of the objects will not arise without the activity of the internal organ intellect. That activity will be caused only by the contact of the conative potency of the individual self. The manifestation of that conative potency will not arise without the evolute raga. So it is obtained that there is conative potency of the individual self which is other than the disposition attachment of the intellect. In order to manifest that potency it is admitted that there is an evolute named raga. In order to manifest the special kind of desire with respect to the external object, the disposition attachment which has its locus in the intellect has been assumed. In order to create aversion in the object of attachment the disposition of detachment of the intellect is also assumed. To assume anything more than these will be against the principle of parsimony.

Even those that assume the potency of aversion for the individual self should of necessity assume the special kind of detachment in the internal organ intellect to cause aversion towards the external object. Aversion in the intellect is caused by the knowledge that a particular thing is the source of pain and it will be caused by the activity of the intellect which perceives the object in a determinate manner and the activity of the intellect is caused by the manifestation of the conative potency itself. So no more cause is required and it is unnecessary to assume that there is a potency of aversion to the individual self. In that case, it may be questioned how the experience that 'I have aversion towards this' occurs on the part of the individual self. The answer is that it is only the activity of intellect that is being reflected on the part of the individual self. Similar activities of intellect and ego namely the determination and identification reflect on the part of the individual self as 'I determine, and I identify'. In other words, I determine it and I identify myself with it takes place only at the stage of the intellect and ego which are being activated by the individual self.

It should be noted here that the effects, kala, vidya, raga etc., of the impure maya are by modification of the material cause even like milk turning into curd and curd turning into buttermilk. In the modification there are two kinds. The first kind is where the material cause is wholly modified into the effect as in the illustration cited. There is also another kind which is a modification of a part of the material cause as in the case of ghee turning into worm at a particular part of it. In this case the activities of the ghee will continue to be present from the part that has not been modified and the activity of the worm also will exist simultaneously by the part modified. In all the cases of the evolutes obtained from the impure maya by modification it is only the second kind that is intended. In other words, it is only partial modification that is intended. Even in transformation in the case of pure maya, it is only partial transformation that is intended. When the evolute Nada is said to be transformed into Bindu, the activities of Nada will continue to be performed by the portion that is not transformed into Bindu and the activities of Bindu will also be simultaneously performed by the transformed portion of the pure maya. So also when the impure maya is modified into kala, and kala into vidya, and vidya into raga the effects of maya, kala, vidya, raga etc., will be felt from the corresponding evolutes as they are formed only by partial modification.

The modifications Time, destiny, kala, vidya and raga which are evolved from impure maya are attached to the individual self like a shirt which is irremovable. So these five evolutes are called by the special name five shirts. Of these, the three evolutes raga, vidya and kala contribute towards the manifestation of the three potencies namely conative, cognitive and volitional and these three potencies are made to activate the internal organ, intellect so that the individual self may have the experiences of the external world which come to the individual self as impressions or modifications of intellect. When the individual self begins to experience the modification of the intellect the evolute destiny restricts the experience only to the extent that is due to the individual self as per its deeds and the evolute Time limits the duration of that experience.

Purusa tattva

When the individual self is clothed with the five evolutes collectively called the five shirts (panca kanjuka) it has the ability to experience in a general way. In order to experience what is called prakṛti, it is to be qualified by the five infirmities, delusion etc. The five infirmities are indiscrimination, egoism, longing, desire and aversion.

Indiscrimination is that sentience which regards perishable things as eternal, impure as the pure, pain as pleasure, and the non-self as the self. Because of this indiscrimination the individual regards non-self as self, this is called egoism. Because of this egoism there is longing on the part of the self that such and such a thing is essential for its existence. Because of this longing there is desire on the part of the individual to get the proximity of the object and there is also aversion towards all things that prevent this proximity. These five infirmities are collectively called the dirt of experience (pumsttva mala). Tiruvalluvar has condensed these five elements into three and has called them desire, anger and ignorance and says that if even the names of these three infirmities are destroyed, then all the pains that are due to be experienced will be destroyed. These five infirmities are peculiar to the class of individual selves called sakalas. These are not the adjuncts of the two other classes of individual selves called pralayakalas and vijñānakalas. So they will not be called the evolute puruṣa.

The need for the adjuncts of these five infirmities in the case of the sakalas is stressed in the following manner. For an experience of a thing, in this case prakṛti, two things are essential, general aptitude towards the experience and a special one. The general aptitude is given by the existence of the five elements of the shirt embodiment (kancuka sarira). This shirt embodiment is also provided in the case of pralayakalas. The special aptitude towards experiencing the nature of prakṛti is supplied by the five infirmities mentioned above. These infirmities are caused from prakṛti itself.

Here an apparent objection may be raised as follows. The dirt of manliness (pumsttva mala) has its origin only in prakṛti. So the evolute of manliness should be described only after prakṛti is dealt with. But here the discussion of the nature of the evolute manliness is taken before the discussion about the nature of prakṛti. Is it proper ?

The answer is as follows. The objection is partly conceded. But in the ritual called wisdom initiation (jñāna dikṣa or adhva suddhi) the purity of the evolute of manliness is effected by removing the impurity called the dirt of manliness and it can follow only after the effecting of purity of mula prakṛti. Also the loci called bhuvanas which are mentioned with respect to the evolute of manliness are situated in the place which is higher than prakṛti and their purity can be effected only after purifying the loci that are situated in prakṛti. Also the individual self as qualified by manliness (puruṣa tattva) has the independence of experiencing prakṛti. For these reasons the five infirmities which constitute the evolute of manliness are enumerated just after raga and just before prakṛti.

It should be clearly understood that the individual itself with the adjuncts of the five infirmities that are derived from prakṛti is called the evolute of manliness. If we say that the individual self which is eternal and sentient will itself be known as the evolute of manliness the following objections become evident.

It is not proper to enumerate a sentient thing as an evolute along with evolutes which are insentient. Further it is also called an effect of maya i.e. mayeya. Also it is purified along with the other evolutes. For these reasons and also for the reason that it is the locus for a number of bhuvanas, it is better that we postulate the evolute of manliness as something which is insentient. So the evolute of

manliness is different from the individual selves and it has its origin in the collection of the five evolutes kala etc., and is insentient and enables the individual self to experience prakṛti. But it is accepted by common consent that five evolutes that act as shirts and the five infirmities are respectively the causes in general and in special for the individual selves to be able to enjoy prakṛti. Hence it is against the principle of parsimony to posit an extra evolute.

Even if such an evolute is posited its function is only to induce experience on the part of the individual self and there is no other use for it. Hence it is unnecessary to posit an evolute without any use against the principle of parsimony.

The evolute of manliness is enumerated after raga before prakṛti even though it is only the individual self. Though the individual self is all pervasive the chief function of manliness is that it is capable of experiencing prakṛti, and the purification of that capability is performed only after the performance of the purification of prakṛti. Hence it is proper that it should be enumerated just after raga and before prakṛti. Also all the evolutes that form the adjuncts of the individual self in order to make it capable of experiencing prakṛti are insentient. It is also known that the individual self identifies itself and assumes the nature of that which it contacts. Hence it is proper to call it by courtesy usage insentient by giving it the name, evolute of manliness.

Sivajñāna Siddhi while classifying the thirty six evolutes classifies the first thirty as insentient, the last five as sentient, and the thirty first one as the self which is both sentient and insentient (cittacittu anma onru). This is because the individual self is really sentient and by courtesy usage it is held to be insentient.

The Agamic version that there are worlds in the evolute of manliness should be interpreted by the use of substitution as in the case of the familiar expression the village of cowherds on the Ganges. In the common expression the word Ganges means only the bank of the Ganges. Similarly the worlds on the evolute of manliness should be taken to mean the worlds in the evolute prakṛti which is near the evolute of manliness. This clarification is given in Pauskara. By this means also it should be understood that the evolute of manliness is none other than the individual self as qualified by the adjuncts

mentioned. If it be some other evolute the worlds ascribed relate to that evolute itself and it is not necessary that the principle of substitution is used and state that the worlds are on some other evolute.

The purification of the evolute of manliness is only the cessation of the inclination of the individual self towards worldly pleasures. This inclination extends from the world of kalagni rudra which exist in the evolute of earth to those in the evolute of kala. In the wisdom initiation this inclination is removed by the ritual of purification in small quantities. This removal assumes a special form upto the purification of the worlds owned by Srikantha Rudra. When the purification of the evolutes kala etc., are taken, even the general form of the inclination towards experience is removed.

Here the general form of inclination may be taken to be subjective, whereas the special form of experience may be considered to be objective in the form of attractive features. In Sivaprakasam in stanza 29 of the general division it is said that in the wisdom initiation where purification is done with respect to kala etc., the purification of the evolution of manliness also is prescribed in the Agamas which are considered to be authoritative. The intention of the author in saying thus is only this. Manliness means the inclination towards experiencing the external objects.

Mula prakrti, prakrti which is the seed of the experiential world

The main function of mula prakrti is to produce the instruments which form the experiential group of 24 from guna to the earth. This mula prakrti takes its origin from kala by the action of Srikantha Rudra. This is also the cause for the origin of the five infirmities, delusion etc., which are collectively called the dirt of manliness.

It is called mula prakrti since it is the root cause for all the experiential instruments. It is also known as prakrti maya, pradhana and mahat. The three qualities sattva, rajasa and tamasa are implied in it in an unmanifested state even as the five colours of a peacock are implied in the liquid contained by its egg. So it is also called avyakta (or unmanifested).

In Sankya philosophy this mula prakrti is considered to be the state of qualities in an equilibrium without any one being either pre-

dominant or less dominant. It also holds it to be eternal, being the material cause of the whole universe without being the effect of any other cause. We have refuted that theory while dealing with the ultimate material cause of the universe. It should be noted that the proper name for the state of equilibrium of the three qualities which are manifest is only *guna tattva* and the state in which the three qualities are unmanifest and subtle alone is called *mula prakṛti*.

It may be pointed out that the instrument of *guna* itself was directly derived from *kala* and it is against the principle of parsimony to suppose the existence of another evolverment *mula prakṛti* in between the two *kala* and *guna*. The answer is as follows. It is an invariable principle that the qualities which manifest in particular in a state of effect should in general be implied in the causal state. As an illustration it may be cited that the five elements are derived from their causal states which are called *tanmatras*, and the *tanmatras* are derived from *ego* which has the quality of *tamasa* in a predominant manner (*bhūtadi ahankara*). The five elements are not directly derived from *bhūtadi ahankara*.

The validity of the existence of *mula prakṛti* in between *kala* and *guna* is established by means of presumption (*arthapatti*) even as indeterminate perception is interposed between awareness and determinate perception. The case of the existence of the literal sound gross (*pasyanti*) between the subtle and impression (*suksma* and *madhyama*) may also be cited as an illustration. In the element of *guna* the three qualities manifest themselves in the particular forms of pleasure, pain and indifference. But in the *mula prakṛti* those qualities are implied in a subtle and general form.

It may be pointed out that *mula prakṛti* may be considered to have its origin in *maya* itself and there is no particular advantage in considering it to have its origin from *kala*. It is not so : *mula prakṛti* is directly experienced by the volitional potency of the self which is manifested by *kala*. This is possible only when *mula prakṛti* is subsumed by *kala*. If it has its origin in *maya* itself it should aid the self in a different manner even like Time and destiny which are derived from *maya*. This cannot be, *kala* is unmanifest whereas *mula prakṛti* implies the three qualities in itself. So it is comparatively gross. Such a *kala* should take its origin from the effect of *maya* which is the effect of *kala*. As *mula prakṛti* is unmanifest the worlds that are

ascribed to that tattva should be considered to exist at the head of guna tattva.

Guna tattva

Mula prakrti implies the three qualities even as the mixture of water and milk. Like the swan that is able to separate water from milk, the potency of Srikantha Rudra churns it and makes the three qualities become manifest separately, in equilibrium. This is guna tattva. Though the qualities are three in number, in action they behave as a single unit. So it is enumerated as a tattva called guna (quality). The three qualities which are named satvika, rajasa and tamasa are mingled together so that a single quality may be considered to be predominant or less dominant and cause pleasure, pain or indifference having the transformation of enlightenment, activity and heaviness. It should be noted that guna tattva is only a transformation and not a modification of mula prakrti and so it is also considered to be identical with mula prakrti.

Since intellect etc., are also different forms of quality, one may be interested to know the difference between them and these (mula prakrti and guna). The distinction is that mula prakrti is implied quality where the qualities are not manifest ; guna tattva is an entity where the three qualities are manifest and are equal in state. When we come to intellect etc., one of these qualities becomes either predominant or less dominant and modification takes place.

If it be so, objection may be raised as follows. In the case when one of the qualities is predominant, the two other qualities are less dominant. So in no case these three qualities are equally manifest and there is no valid means of ascertaining the state of their equilibrium. The answer is that it is not so. It is only to the principles that are equal and in equilibrium it is possible for one of them to be predominant making others less dominant. Hence it is to be accepted that guna tattva where the three qualities are equal and in equilibrium is to be considered as existent.

Intellect

Intellect is derived from guna tattva as a tattva in which the quality of sattva is predominant where the other two qualities are less dominant, in the form of a modification. It aids the self which

has manliness in a general form from purusa derived from kala etc., and in a particular form from the qualities of mula prakrti. The self at this stage is enabled to experience the effects of prakrti. To such a self whose cognitive potency has been made manifest by means of vidya in a general form, this intellect makes it manifest in particular forms towards the various objects. It becomes the instrument for determinate perception where the object is discriminated by means of its name, universal, etc. After this determinate perception the intellect becomes modified into the ideas of the objects. This idea becomes the object of experience to the self. Thus intellect is not only an instrument for determinate perception, but also it modifies itself into the object of experience of the self which every worldly perception leads to. Since it is so, it becomes the support for all the actions that are done by the self which adhere to it in the form of merits and demerits.

These merits and demerits cause the eight dispositions, virtue, wisdom, detachment, power, vice, ignorance, attachment and powerlessness which are developed into the fifty determinations (pratyaya) and their expansions. Intellect is the locus for the merits and demerits, dispositions, determinations and their expansion. The determinate perception is not caused by any other tattva, so by presumption, the tattva intellect is posited.

The concept of determination should be held as follows : the self without having any connection with the internal organs directly acts with the sense organs through the instrument of vidya which is in inseparable connection with it. Then the self has the indeterminate perception of the external object in a general form, 'Here is an object'. This is the first impression which is made by the external object on any one of the sense organs. (It is called sensation in modern psychology).

Then the self works through the internal organ, mind, which first in the form of citta decides to determine what it is and then makes some proposals which are called sankalpa which end in doubt (vikalpa). The proposal takes the form that it is the post or that it is the man etc. This causes the desire to determine what the object is. After that the self acts through the ego. The ego decides to come to a particular correct decision and activates the vital air which affects the blood circulation which enables the determination. Then the

self activates the intellect and the intellect causes the determinate perception in the form, ' It is the post or it is the pot or it is the cloth ' etc. This particular form of perception determines the object with respect to its attributes which are five in number. They are the name of the object, its class, its quality, its action and its substance. This determinate perception is what is called determination of the object.

From the above, the difference between the activities of the sense organs and the internal organs how each activity forms the link of the whole process knit together as cause and effect will be known.

The determinate perception is caused by the intellect ; but as the mind starts the process of perception, it is called mental perception (manadak katchi). In Sivajnana Siddhi it is said that the intellect may be referred to as mind and vice versa by the use of the figure substitution. There has been a confusion among the scholars to mistake the activity of one as the activity of the other between the intellect and the mind. They think that because determinate perception is named mental perception, determination of a thing with its attributes name, class etc., is the activity of the mind, which is called sankalpa. What is determination is the proposal that such and such things should be performed by me. This should not be accepted. The determination of a thing with its attribute name, class etc., is nowhere called sankalpa.

The determination that such and such things should be performed by me is not different from egoism that makes the decision that a particular thing should be done by oneself. So it is the activity of the ego and not of the intellect. Mind which results in doubtfulness will never determine, as determination is quite the opposite of doubtfulness. If it be insisted that mind which doubts can also determine them, then there will be no uniformity that different activities are performed by different elements which are called evolvents or tattvas, and even one evolvent may be taken to perform all the functions. Hence the insistence should be refuted as the opinion of those that do not distinguish between the mind and the intellect.

It is a matter of common acceptance by all thinkers that the wisdom which is the perspective of a thing with the determination of its attributes name, class etc., is the same thing that is experienced by the self in the form of pleasure, pain or indifference, in the case of

experiential perception. If the determinate perception is taken to be the activity of the mind, it will be contradictory to call the intellect as the object of experience and hence it is the main support of the merits and demerits and that it is the locus of the eight disposition virtue, wisdom etc.

The Naiyayikas and others will say that the dispositions virtue, wisdom etc., are the qualities of the self. The qualities that are ephemeral are to be attributed only to inert objects, not to the sentient self.

If they are attributed to the sentient self as we shall explain in a future section on tanmatra, then it will be contradictory to say that the self is eternal, for if the quality is destructible, then the substance of which it is attributed will also be destructible. So it is not admissible. From this it should be known that the support of the impression which enables one to think of a thing which is experienced by means of recognition should be attributed only to the evolvent intellect and not to the self which is not an evolvent.

From this it must also follow that the opinion that the self is the locus of the merits and demerits is also refutable.

If it be so, then to say that the intellect is the locus of wisdom is inconsistent with the dictum that it is inert. It is not inconsistent for even though the evolvent intellect is inert yet it has originated with the quality of enlightenment (sattva) predominant. So it is only consistent to take that the intelligence of the self is reflected in the intellect even as the image that is perceived in a mirror.

Among the dispositions of the intellect virtue, wisdom, detachment and power are the results of the quality, sattva (goodness, purity). Vice, ignorance and powerlessness are the results of the quality tamasa (darkness, dullness). Attachment is the result of rajasa (passion, activity). Even the powerlessness which is the cause for infatuation is attributed to the quality of tamasa by some Agamas.

Virtue : Among the eight dispositions virtue consists of two factors, control and disciplined order (yama and niyama). Of these control consists of non-killing, truthfulness, non-stealing, celibacy and inner purity. Discipline consists of the five qualities freedom from

anger, worship, external purity, feeling of happiness and impartiality. These are the essentials to a person who performs the virtuous acts enjoined by the scripture. Virtuous qualities such as sympathy, absence of haughtiness, hospitality, friendliness, impartiality will be included in these ten qualities.

Wisdom : Wisdom may be classified into eight kinds. The first kind is the discriminatory power which one enjoys owing to his destiny. When one is affected by the three sources of pain one's wisdom becomes sharpened. The three sources are the self (adīanmika), the inert things (adibhaudika), the unknown sources (adidaivika). The wisdom which occurs to one when one suffers from these three sources are classified into three kinds. The fifth one is the wisdom that comes to a person when he is admonished by his sincere friends. The wisdom that comes to a person from the self study of scriptures and the wisdom that comes to a person from such a study with the help of the master. There is also the wisdom that comes to a person from virtuous actions performed by him. Thus the wisdom may be counted as eight kinds and so the freedom which he gains as a result of these eight kinds are also of eight kinds. They are also called attainments (siddhi).

These wisdom may be each reclassified into ten kinds as follows according to their concept of things.

The materialists hold the physical body as the self. The physical body is the effect of the five elements. So they are unable to know about the evolvents beyond the five elements. So their release is in the world of elements. The Kaulas who hold that the vital air is the self will also attain their place of release in the world of elements. The astrologers hold that the locus of release lies in the world of stars. So they also attain their place of release in the world of elements. Those who act according to the law books (smṛti), hold that the Absolute is the source of the five elements. The source of five elements is none other than tanmatras (subtle elements). So they have no idea of the existence of the world other than the subtle elements and their place of release lies in the subtle elements. Among the materialists some hold the self as the sense organs. Some others think that citta is the self. Others hold mind and the ego are respectively the self. So their places of release consist in the world of senses etc.

The place of release for the Buddhists and the Naiyayikas is the world of intellect, for the Buddhist hold the self as the wisdom which is the modification of the intellect and the Naiyayikas hold the intellect as the quality of the self.

The Jains who speak of the Syadvada will attain their place of release in the evolvent which is called *guna*, for their doubtful nature is due to the nature of the qualities goodness etc., which exists in unstable equilibrium.

The Pancaratrins hold that their supreme Being Narayana exists beyond the twenty-four evolvents which are collectively called the *atma tattvas*. Since the primal *prakṛti* is alone the principle which exists beyond the twenty-four evolvents, their place of release is in the primal *prakṛti*. The monists will attain their release in the evolvent manliness (*purusa*) which has attained the experiential potency in general as well as particular form.

It is easy to infer from the above examples the places of release of the other religionists belonging to the external division.

The principle followed in ascribing various evolvents as the places of release to the respective religionists is that they are capable of attaining the places which they can conceived of, and that they cannot go beyond that limit.

These evolvents can be counted as ten in number as the elements, subtle elements, sense organs, *citta*, mind, ego, intellect, *guna*, unmanifested primal *prakṛti* and the manliness (*purusa*). Hence the eight wisdoms when multiplied by these ten kinds become elaborated into eighty kinds. These places of release are confined to the values of the religionists who are classified as belonging to the outer and the outermost groups. This is because we are limited to the dispositions of the intellect. But we should not forget that there are twelve more evolvents, the concept of which will enable the persons who conceive of them to attain places of release in the respective evolvents.

The intellect which is of the form of the qualities cannot go beyond the evolvents primal *prakṛti* and manliness (*purusa*). So the cause for the release of those that conceive of higher evolvents is only the various descents of grace, which are attributed to such

evolved souls. Thus the place of release which is the expansion of the wisdom which is a disposition of the intellect is named as siddhi without its classifications, and when classified according to the various causes become eight in number, and when elaborated according to the loci becomes eighty in number

Detachment : Detachment becomes classified into ten kinds as per the difference in their causes. Detachment is caused when people who suffer from ailments are seen by the thought that their physical existence is also subject to similar ailments. It is also caused by the sufferings that come to a person through the three sources.

A man becomes detached when he is subject to the pains which are involved in the acquisition and preservation of wealth.

When a person loses his friends and others, he becomes detached from the life, thinking that the pains are caused only by making friendship with such good persons.

A licentious person who usually is devoted to his object of love when perceives some quality in that object not to his liking becomes detached from the object of love.

There is also the detachment from the body which requires regular nourishment for its upkeep.

There is also a feeling of detachment when a person is not inclined to beg of certain persons for the sake of wealth.

There is also a tenth kind of detachment which is not caused by such worldly happenings but which comes to a person, as a result of his asceticism practised in previous births. Thus there are ten kinds of detachment. The cheerfulness (tusti) that comes to a person who is detached is also classified into ten kinds as per their causes. These ten kinds of cheerfulness cause the ten kinds of places of release as said above. So the elaboration of cheerfulness becomes ten into ten or hundred in number.

Power : The power is classified into eight kinds. Of these assumption of a subtle and invisible form is called Anima ; assumption of a great form like a mountain is called mahima. The ability to become as light as air is called lagima. Here the person can move with swiftness against retarding substances like watery mud.

The fourth power is called prapti. Here the yogin gets everything as per his desire. The fifth attainment is called prakamya which consists in enjoying several objects simultaneously. The sixth attainment is called Isatva which consists of the power of control over even the divinities like the creator. The power to attract everything as per one's wishes and to create is called vasiṭva. The eighth attainment is called garima which enables a person to retain his freedom inspite of his experiencing worldly objects. Of these eight attainments the first three are the attainments of the bodily existence whereas the remaining ones are the attainments by the mind etc.

These attainments belong to the inhabitants of eight kind of worlds, the intensity of the attainment being onefold, twofold, threefold etc., upto eightfold. The souls are respectively the devils who have the capacity to pervade the earth and enjoy the attainment onefold only. Next come the demons who pervade even the world of water and enjoy the attainment twofold. Then come the yakṣas who pervade even the world of fire and enjoy the attainment threefold.

The inhabitants of the world of music have the power to pervade even the world of air and they enjoy the attainments fourfold. The inhabitants of svarga can pervade even the ether and enjoy the attainments fivelfold. Similarly the inhabitants of the world of Soma, the world of Prajapati and the world of creator have respectively the powers to pervade the evolvents mind, ego and intellect and can enjoy the attainments, sixfold, sevenfold and eightfold respectively. Thus the powers become expanded into sixty-four kinds.

Virtue causes wisdom, wisdom causes detachment and detachment causes powerfulness. They are respectively classified into ten and eight respectively.

Vice : The persons who have attained high powers become haughty and leave the path of meditation. They become entangled into worldly objects and thereby become vicious. Even vice is classified into ten kinds. They are the opposites of the ten virtues and are respectively killing, falsehood, theft, licentiousness, envy, anger, disobedience, impurity, revenge and partiality.

Ignorance : This is caused by vice and is classified into five kinds namely tama, moha, mahamoha, tamisra, anta tamisra. Of these

tama consists in misunderstanding non-self as the self. The expansion of the misunderstanding may be made into ten kinds as per the non-self is taken to be the elements etc.

Moha consists in mistaking the yogic attainments such as the invisibility of the body etc., as the highest value in life. This misunderstanding may be classified into eight kinds according as the source is anima etc.

Mahamoha consists in mistaking the objects of senses to be the highest values in life. The five objects of senses when divided into desirable and hateful ones each become ten in number.

Tamisra consists in the sorrow which one experiences while his desire is not fulfilled. The objects of desire may be the ten objects of senses and the eight kinds of yogic attainments.

Anta tamisra consists in the sorrow that one experiences when he is robbed of his attainments by a more powerful yogin. This can also be elaborated into eighteen kinds with respect to the objects of robbery. Thus ignorance may be expanded into sixty four kinds.

Attachment : Attachment is desire to enjoy sense objects. It is caused by ignorance. It is the opposite of detachment and so can be elaborated into hundred kinds. The cause for powerlessness is lack of energy (asakti). This lack of energy is classified into one hundred and seventy-six causes of powerlessness. These causes are sixty-four kinds of ignorance, hundred kinds of attachment and the five organs which may be counted as mind, ego, the five organs of action and the five sense organs.

Powerlessness : This lack of energy causes powerlessness which may also be referred to as poverty. This poverty is of eight kinds, being the opposites of the eight attainments invisibleness etc.

So it can be concluded that there are seven hundred and twelve transformations of the intellect which consists of four hundred and thirty-six kinds of dispositions and one hundred and thirty-six kinds of lack of energy. The disposition powerlessness or poverty will enable a person to have the disposition of virtue. Hence the eight dispositions of the intellect form a whirlwind or eddy in which the self is caught and is unable to get away from the cycle of birth and death.

The evolvent ego : We know that determinate perception is caused by the evolvent intellect. This objective determination cannot be caused unless there is a subjective determination in the form, 'I shall determine what it is'. This subjective determination is the function the evolvent ego, which has its origin in the intellect. This is originated by the predominance of the quality of passion and activity (rajasa) over the two other qualities goodness and dullness (sattva and tamasa).

From the above it is noticed that the functions of the intellect and the ego may be classified under the common term determination. Hence there may be an objection why these evolvents should be considered to be different without assigning the function determination to a single evolvent.

The determination of the intellect pertains to the object. It differs from object to object, as 'This is the garland of roses', 'This is a sandal paste', etc. But the determination which we ascribe to ego is subjective and is the same in all cases. It is of the form, 'I shall determine what it is'. Hence these two kinds can never be attributed to the same evolvent.

In the case of intellect the quality of goodness and purity predominates whereas in the case of the ego the quality of passion and action predominates. For this reason also these two must be considered to be non-identical.

Even though the evolvent ego is only an instrument for the self, it acts as an agent in so far as its function is to arrive at a decision in the form 'I shall determine what it is'. So it is called an agent by the usage of courtesy. But the function of intellect is to discriminate the impression caused by the external world on the sense organ and to scrutinise the various particular elements in the image produced of the object. Hence intellect is objective whereas the evolvent ego is subjective. So they are different.

This evolvent ego is different, from self to self, even like the evolvent intellect. It is because of this fact that different persons make different determinations such as 'I shall go to Madras', 'I shall finish my meal now' etc. This ego is further subdivided into three kinds, taijasa, vaikarika and bhutadi according as one or the other

of the three qualities goodness and purity, passion and activity, darkness and dullness predominates.

It should be known that the internal organ mind and the five sense organs originate from the taijasa aspect. The five organs of action originate from the vaikarika aspect, and the subtle elements originate from the bhutadi aspect.

The evolvent mind

Mind is the organ which makes proposals ending in doubtfulness after the indeterminate perception which is caused by one of the sense organs, the gate way of knowing the external world. The proposals may be defined as the function which comes after thinking as to what kind of object is being perceived, is it a pot, is it a piece of cloth, is it a boy etc. After noticing the attributes that qualify the object. This determination is the result of the previous impression which a person has gained as a result of precious experience.

Doubtfulness is the ambiguity whether a particular object is a pot or not, etc. The feeling of doubtfulness is a desideratum to the proposal, as the determinate perception does not occur directly from the proposal.

The two functions proposal and doubtfulness are attributed to a single evolvent because there is no difference in the result even though there is difference in time. It is only the difference in result that is taken into consideration in deciding the difference in the evolvent.

To the enquiry what it is, the indeterminate perception alone is the cause. To the proposal which affirms that the object is such and such, the latent impressions which become patent after the enquiry is the cause. So the psychic functions enquiry and the proposal not only differ in the factor of time, but also with respect to their causes. Hence it may be asked how the same evolvent mind can be attributed to the two functions, one the enquiry and two the proposal.

The question is justified. But as there is no difference in the

result that follows the function enquiry is attributed to citta which is only a transformation of the mind.¹

From the above discussion we have arrived at the conclusion that there is an evolvent by name citta. Since it is not the result of modification as in the cases of other evolvents, Saint Umapati considers it as something identical with mind. So he says in Sivaprakasam, stanza thirty one of the general section that citta which is the cause for thinking cannot be counted as something different from the mind which causes the proposal followed by doubtfulness.²

The interpretation given by Sivajnana Munivar to the scriptural text quoted by him is : the function of citta is to enquire or think what the object presented is. This causes doubtfulness by making patent what is present in the latent form of the impression caused by previous experiences of the object.

Among the preceptors there is formal difference in enumerating the evolvents of the primal prakṛti. Some preceptors take the internal organs as three. They separately enumerate guṇa as an evolvent different from the primal prakṛti. They say that there are twenty-four evolvents below the primal prakṛti. There are others who consider the primal prakṛti and the evolvent guṇa as being identical and according to them the internal organs are four in number, the intellect, the ego, the mind and citta. According to these preceptors also there are twenty-four evolvents below the primal prakṛti.

There are others who identify the mind and citta as one and guṇa and primal prakṛti as one and according to them, the twenty-fourth evolvent is the primal prakṛti. These are not contradictory in essential matters.

¹ Saivite psychologists differ in their opinion in defining citta. The commentator Sivajnana Munivar takes it to be a transformation of the internal organ, mind, and he defines its function as the enquiry as to what it is that has caused the indefinite impression. But there are others who consider it as a separate internal organ which functions, in the form of memory in sleep, and they call it a different aspect of primal prakṛti. This opinion is shared by Sivagra Yogin and others.

² From a study of Jnanamṛtam which distinguishes between the state of sleep and that of the dream, it is seen that the interpretation of the scriptural statements given by Sivajnana Munivar may be taken to mean otherwise. The interpretation is 'that unless mind is present the thought that passes on through citta cannot be expressed, even though citta functions in sleep. The same function of citta that exists in the state of dream is capable of expression in the state of wakefulness because of the presence of the mind in the state of dream.'

There are some who hold that the internal organs are only three in number and there is no internal organ by the name citta. But this is not so. If there is no citta, there should be proposal and doubtfulness in all the things that are perceived. This does not occur. So among those things that have been the object of indeterminate perception, it is only those that have been selected by citta for enquiry and given to the mind that is subject to proposal and doubtfulness. Hence it is certain that there exists an organ which is called citta to present the object which has been perceived indeterminately to the mind, which is its cause.

It may be argued that it is the desire to know about the object which is the cause for the mental action proposal and doubtfulness. But this is not so. A man who is in search of a thing that has been lost by him comes to know all the objects even without the desire to know them. There it is not the desire to know that is the main cause for knowing the object. It may be said that the effect of the previous deeds is the cause for knowing the object. But even the deed cannot work unless there is an instrument to manifest it. This has been shown when we dealt with the subject of Niyati or necessity. As there is no other cause for knowing it, it should be posited that citta which is the transformation of the mind exists to cause such knowledge.

It may be pointed out that in Siddhiyar it is said that citta which is identical with the primal prakṛti will perform the function of thinking or enquiry. There citta is considered to be a state of primal prakṛti. So it may be asked what is said in Siddhiyar is contradictory to the dictum of Sivaprakāśa which says that citta is a transformation of the mind. It is not contradictory, for the primal prakṛti (avyakta, unmanifest) may denote by courtesy usage even the internal organs. Even then the question may be raised, in the following manner. In Sivaprakāśam, citta is referred to after the subject of mind, but in Siddhiyar it is spoken of in connection with the evolvent guṇa. Hence it is a source of confusion. This cannot be taken to be a source of confusion as in poetry the order of a subject dealt with need not be the same. The same reason is applicable to the statement of the internal organs in unmai vilakkam which enumerates them in the order mind, intellect, ego and Citta. There the evolvent intellect is enumerated between the evolvents mind and ego. This is a case of poetical licence.

Those who are ignorant of this fact will consider what is given in *unmai vilakkam* is the natural order. They will say that it is only after the determination by the intellect the function of ego takes place and it is only after the function of the evolvent ego enquiry by *citta* takes place. But it should be known as per our discussion that it is only after the enquiry by *citta* the proposal and doubtfulness of the mind take place and it is only after the determination by ego the decision by the intellect happens.

Now it may be asked that ego may be considered to be a transformation of intellect because of the sameness of the two functions of determination on the analogy of *citta* and mind of which the former is taken to be a transformation of the latter because of the similarity of their functions and to say that ego is a modification of intellect is not consistent. It is not so.

The activities of the mind and *citta* though different pertain to the object. Further the difference in their activities lies only in the temporal order so as to facilitate the manifestation of the impression due to the previous experience of the object. So it is proper to hold *citta* as a transformation of the mind and to include it in that evolvent. But the activity of the evolvent ego pertains to the subject and is in the form 'I shall decide what the nature of the object is' and determination by intellect is of the form that the object is such and such and pertains to the object. Hence the difference between the activities of these two evolvements ego and intellect is considerable and it is not proper to consider ego as a transformation of intellect and include it in that evolvent.

The evolvent which apprehends the universal nature of a thing and also that which enables a person to recognise an object should be known to be the mind itself. The idea of the universal may be understood from the following illustration. When a person sees a pot and comes to know that it is called a pot we need not instruct him that similar things are known to be pots. When he sees any other pot he knows it already to be any object of that name. This mental generalisation of the concept (of the sense of a word) is called the universal. Recognition is that faculty in which a person knows an object to have been previously cognised.

The Naiyayikas say with respect to the cognition of the universal that at the time when a person sees a particular object and knows

its name, there follows a general cognition⁷ of all things belonging to the same class. They name it as the general perception. It is not proper to explain the process in that manner.

If a person perceives a particular thing and immediately a perception of all objects of that class follows, he should become omniscient. But this is not the intention of even the Naiyayikas when they give the above explanation.

Another point which the Naiyayikas say must also be refuted. They establish the atomic nature of the mind as follows. They base their arguments on the experience of having the perception of one sense object at a time and not perceiving all objects simultaneously. The reason for perceiving one sense object at a time is, they say, that the perception requires the conjunction of the mind with that particular sense. If the mind is a gross evolvent it can have the conjunction with all the senses at the same time. So it follows that the mind is subtle or atomic and hence eternal. It is not proper to explain like that.

The mind which has its origin from ego is gross with respect to all the evolvents down to ego. The cognitive potency of the self which is manifested by vidya will activate only one sense organ at a time. This is the reason for cognising one sense object at a time, and not the conjunction of mind with the sense. So to say that mind is atomic, on the basis of its conjunction with the senses, is not proper.

Mind is considered to be a sense organ which acts both internally and externally, for it brings the impression of the external objects on the senses before intellect as an image so that it may be determined by it. It is compared to the pupil of the eye of the crow. So its origin from the sattvika aspect of ego just before the origin of the five senses is justified. Mind is considered to be in motion always.

From the above discussion it should be noted that an object is sensed by the external senses at first in a general manner. Then it is caught hold of by the internal sense mind. Then ego decides to know its nature in detail. Then alone the intellect has the determinate perception of the object. Thus the various instruments act in a particular way in order to produce the determinate perception. It is clear that the evolvents do not act simultaneously. After the determinate perception, experience of the object takes place.

*A stanza in Sivaprakasam says that in the experience of a particular external object, the activities of one of the five senses, one of the five subtle elements the four internal organs and the five inner most instruments kala etc., are combined together. There the intention behind the expression that the self experiences an object when these instruments are combined together, is that their activities take place with respect to that particular object in order. Some people take it to mean that the various instruments act simultaneously. From the above explanation it should be known that their impression is wrong.

Sense Organs : After the evolvent mind the cognitive sense organs the ear etc., take their origin in order from the sattvika aspect of ego. By the figure of substitution the instruments of the senses are indicated by the loci, ear etc. These sense organs cognise their respective objects in an indeterminate form. The determinate cognition of the object involves the difference of the quality and the qualified or attribute and the thing attributed. Since these organs are instruments of cognition it is proper that they are derived from the sattvika aspect of ego.

The materialists will assert that the bodily constituents ear etc., are the sense organs. But a deaf person has ear and yet cannot hear the sound. So it is clear that the bodily constituents are the loci whereas the sense organs are things different from performing their action having the constituent as their places. What is said with regard to ear is to be extended with respect to other sense organs as well.

The sense organ of eye :* Of the five sense organs the eye has to travel towards its objects in order to have conjunction with it whereas the other organs have their conjunction with their objects even as they are. But the bodily constituent eye cannot travel towards its objects. This is another reason for holding the sense organ as different from the bodily organs.

*Sivaprakasam 63

*The commentator is ingenious enough to establish the contact of the object with the eye by the movement of the light of the eye. It is plausible so long as the property of the light rays is not known. But now from science we know that the light on the object travels through the aperture and the crystalline lense to have contact with the retina. The correctness of the modern science is to be established by the construction of the eye with its various constituents.

If it be so, then it may be assumed that the eye need not travel towards its object and that the presence of the object in front of the eye without any intervening obstacle is enough for the perception. But it is not so. The tactile sense etc., perceive their objects only with their conjunction with them. The eye also is an external sense like the others. Hence it is necessary that it should have conjunction with the object for its perception.

The cause for the perception of the object by the eye should be decided to be the conjunction of the eye with it, for the following reason. The position of the object just in front of the eye cannot be the cause for the perception, for an object behind a wall though in front of the eye cannot be seen. But it may be argued that the wall is the intervening factor that spoils the opposition of the object in front of the eye. But an object behind a person can be seen by the person if he holds a mirror before him as the image of the object.

Now it may be asked how contact can be established between the eye and its object through the mirror. The answer is as follows. The light of the eye is reflected by the mirror so that it may have contact with the object behind. This is like the rays of the Sun being reflected by the surface of water in a pot (in front of the Sun) on the wall which is inside a house.

As this is so the face of the object is seen within the mirror and to know that as one's own face, is a true perception. It should also be known that as there is no face within the mirror one's own face is seen within the mirror as a different one. By the principle of consistency one should decide the appearance of the face as though it is within the mirror and the difference in the size of the face alone should be considered to be erroneous or false.

The image within the mirror performs consistently whatever action is performed by the object such as laughter etc. So it should be concluded that the object alone is seen within the mirror and there is no face within it different from the object. As there is no cause to produce a different face within the mirror it is not proper to hold that a different face has been created within the mirror.

Even if the reflecting medium such as water is in darkness it is able to show the object by reflection provided the object is exposed

to light. This fact strengthens our view that it is only the object which is seen as though it is behind the reflecting surface.

Those who posit that there is a face within the mirror different from the face which is the object, may say that the light that surrounds the object enables one to see its image also. But it is not so. It is only that light which falls on an object that will enable to see it and not the light which surrounds any other object. From this argument the proposition of those who speak of the face which is seen in the water as being erroneous is also refuted. Even the erroneous perception will not take place if there is no light on it. If one says that false perception can take place in darkness then even in thick darkness one should perceive a rope as a snake and this is not the case.

An object which is at a greater distance is seen faintly whereas an object which is comparatively near is seen more clearly. From this it should be concluded that the contact with object is necessary to see. Also it is a fact of common observation that the intensity of light becomes fainter as the distance of the source becomes greater. The same thing should be attributed to the light of the eye also. Hence a distant object is seen fainter than a nearer one.

The following objection may be raised if it be assumed that the contact of the eye with the object not only is essential but also the presence of the object in front of it. The tip of a branch of a tree and the moon in the sky are seen simultaneously. The objects within a box made of glass are also visible to the eye. These two instances require an explanation. The explanation is as follows.

When hundred petals of a lotus are arranged one over the other and a sharp needle is sent through them, it is clear that the needle passes through the petals at different times. But the duration of time is so short that it appears as though the needle has passed through all the petals simultaneously. A similar explanation is to be given for seeing the top of the branch of a tree and the moon in the sky at the same time. The glass is a pure substance and it allows the light of the eye to pass through it so as to establish contact with the object.

The cause for the sight of the tip of the branch and the moon at the same time is only the inability to distinguish between the short duration of Time involved. It should be known that a piece of glass

is not an obstructing substance even like the wall for the subtler light of the eye.

The sight of gross objects like mountains by the subtle light of the eye should be understood from the illustration where a fine drop of oil spreads throughout the surface of water on which it is split. We see how the light of a lamp spreads throughout the space in which it is placed. So also the light of the eye spreads throughout the surface with which it comes in contact.

A thing which has for its locus another thing cannot be away from the locus. But the light of the eye has the pupil of the eye as its locus. Even when the pupil of eye is immersed in darkness, the external thing which is exposed to light is seen by it. It shows that the light of the eye passes through the medium of darkness to the object which is exposed to light. Is it possible for the light of the eye to go away from its locus? Such a question may be asked.

The sense of sight has its origin from the sattvika aspect of ego. The sattvika aspect is even greater than in other cognitive senses. When a lamp is placed within darkness, the rays of the light has the power to pierce through the darkness and illumine a distant object. So also by the virtue of the predominance of the sattvika, the light of the eye pass through darkness towards the object and has contact with it.

If it be so then it may be asked that an eye with the opening lids sees an object exposed to external light. When the eye lids are closed the eye should see the object. It is not so. Even as a lamp on the pot when closed by an external object, the light disappears quickly. So also the light of the eye which proceeds from the eye rapidly disappears as soon as the eye lids are closed. Here disappearance mean that the light of the eye becomes involved in the sense.

If it be so even the other sense organs ear etc., have their origin from the sattvika aspect of the ego, so they should also be enabled to travel from their loci. But it is not so. The reason is that we have no such experience. It must be posited that the sattvika aspect which originates the eye organ is predominant over the sattvika aspect which originates the other four sense organs. So it is held that the eye alone can travel towards its object in order to have its contact and

objectify it, whereas the four other sense organs have their contact with the object only when the object comes towards them.

On the analogy of the eye the sense organ ear also may be held to travel towards its object and have contact with it. The reason is as follows. We are able to distinguish between directions of the source of sound such as from the north, from the south, from different loci such as from the palace from the temple etc., and the instruments that cause the sound such as the pipe fiddle etc. This distinction cannot be known unless the sense organ has direct contact with the object. But it is not so. The sound which has its origin at the source travels like the waves of water in air and is brought near the ear by means of air in order and it has the cognizance of the object only when it reaches the ear. With regard to the direction of the sound it is conjectured from the particular nature of the impression of the sound on the ear even as the direction of an arrow that speeds and falls near the person is conjectured from the particular nature of its fall. The source of the sound is also conjectured from the previous experience. This is the only way in which our experiences fit in. So it should be concluded that the ear, even as the tactile sense, can cognise the object only when it comes to it and has contact with it. It is not proper to hold the sense of ear as travelling towards its object even like the light of the eye.

The nature of the sound travelling like the waves on water should also be determined from the fact that the distant soft sound is not heard even like the loud sound whereas the soft sound originates near the ear is heard by it. From the above discussion the following correct decision may be arrived at. In all cases the sense organs should have contact with their object to know them. It is not enough that if the object is present directly before the sense organs like the eye. Of the five senses it is only the eye that travels towards its object by means of its light and not the other senses which are stationary and require the contact of their objects with them. In all cases it may also be seen that the sense organs are different from the places of the body at which they function.

The existence of darkness : It may be asked why the organ of eye which has its origin from the sattvika aspect of the ego, should require the aid of another light. Even though the sense of eye has its origin in the sattvika aspect of ego, yet it has to travel towards its object in

the form of eye's light unlike the other four sense organs. So its modification in its origin involves the essence of the sattvika aspect of ego. So in that part the essence of the tamasa aspect of ego becomes modified into darkness which forms intimate obstacle of the eye. The modification of the origin of the light of the eye and that of the darkness are simultaneous.

In order to remove that obstacle the external light which is the modification in the form of sattvika from the tamasa aspect of the ego is required. The external light is the very opposite of darkness. Darkness is the modification of the tamasa aspect which remains as the balance after the origin of the sense organ eye. The external light is the modification of the balance of sattvika from tamasa aspect of the ego. Hence they are the opposites.

Such an external light aids the light of the eye which is similar to it in as much as it is the modification of the essence of the sattvika aspect of ego. The appropriateness of this should be seen. From the above explanation it should be known that to hold the darkness as the absence of light is incorrect. The systems that hold darkness as the absence of light will ask how the origin of darkness etc., can be explained if it be held as a positive entity. Those who hold darkness as the absence of light should hold pain as the absence of pleasure, vice as the absence of virtue, separation as the absence of contact etc. But they do not hold such views. Hence it should be known that their intention may not be the same as their expression.

Absence of a thing cannot be of any use even like the seeming udder at the neck of the goat. But we have the concept that there is no light in the place, where as there is darkness in it and the darkness prevents the eye from seeing a thing present. The existence of darkness by means of elimination can be seen from the fact that our sight is prevented from seeing anything at first when we open the eye in open space. As we experience darkness as something black in colour it may be suggested that darkness may be considered to be an object black in colour. It is not so.

An object should be seen only when we open the eye but the black colour is seen even when we close the eye. So it should be considered a result of ignorance and not an object. In Tiruvarutpayan it is said that 'darkness will prevent us from seeing all objects but

will enable us to know its existence' ; thereby we should not think that darkness is an object of sight. It means only that its existence can be known by means of elimination.

Now it may be suggested on the analogy of the primal bondage which is considered to be one having innumerable potencies that the sense organ may be considered to be one having five different functions. It is not so. In the case of the primal bondage even though the individual selves are innumerable the prevention of their powers of cognition, conation and volition is one and so the primal bondage which prevents their powers is posited to be one but then since the defining nature of bondage and freedom of the self are innumerable, it was decided that the primal bondage had innumerable potencies. But in the case of the sense organs even from the beginning they are posited to be five different ones in order to have five different functions. So it is contradictory to say that they are one in number after coming to the decision that they are many.

If it be so among the two kinds of organs the internal and external, it may be argued that even one of them is enough and it is against the principle of parsimony to posit the existence of both of them. The external organs know their objects with respect to the present time alone whereas the internal organs know them with respect to the three times, past, present and future. This is the difference between them. So it is necessary that both of them are to be posited. In the case of blind or deaf person since the external organs are absent the internal organs may not be useful. In order that they may become useful to them even the external organs are posited. Hence it is not against the principle of parsimony.

It is also a well known principle that unless a thing is known it is not to be acted upon. This principle also insists that there should be necessarily the presence of sense organs in order to aid the organs of action. The Naiyayikas and such other people argue that as sound etc., are the qualities of the elements like the sky etc., the sense organs which cognise these qualities should be thought of as being the effects of the elements. If the sense organs are taken to be gross form like the pot etc., and they should be perceived by other sense organs which leads to infinite regress. Hence the suggestion is not proper.

There is also another objection to the view that the sense organs belong to the same class as the qualities or the objects which they

perceive, for the organ of the eye not only reveals the presence of the element fire, but also reveals the form of the earth etc., and hence it should be considered as an effect of earth as well. The people who advance the above argument do not hold that view. Hence it is known that their intention is something different. It should also be noted that ear etc., reveal the qualities of not only the elements of ether etc., but also the qualities of other elements. Hence it will be known that the arguments advanced by the schools who wish to prove that the sense organs are the effects of the elements are erroneous. The quality of sound is not only the attribute of the sky but also it is the attribute of the other four elements. The sense of touch is not only the quality of air but it is also the quality of fire, water and earth. Similarly the form is the quality of the three elements fire, water and the earth. Taste is the quality of water and earth. It should also be noted that the sense organs which have the quality of sattva cannot be considered as the effect of the elements which are of the nature of tamas which causes ignorance.

Instruments of action : The organs of action which have their origin from the rajasa aspect of ego are five in number. They are the organ of speech, the leg, the hand, the genital organ and the excretory organ. Even in these cases the organs should be distinguished from the place which is the constituent of the body.

As these are the organs of action the appropriateness of having their origin in the rajasa aspect of the ego should be appreciated. The sense organs manifest only the cognitive potency of the self. So the need for the organs which manifest the volitional potency will be felt. Here by action is meant the volitional potency of the self. Even though the potencies of cognition and volition are the same in nature, yet as they are different in their manifestation, two kinds of organs are required.

Now it may be felt that there are functions like raising the brow etc., which cannot be included among the functions of the five instruments of action. But it is not so. All the instruments are supposed to be pervasive in the body and the action raising the brow should be treated as one of the functions of the hand. Thus all the actions that are manifested in the physical body should be included under the instruments of action. Hence such a question does not arise.

Even though the instruments like the hand pervade through out the body and has for its locus the brow etc., hand is supposed to have its special locus in the hand. So it is called hand. It should be noted that the constituent parts of the physical body themselves are not the instruments. The instruments have these parts of the body as their special loci. This is because even though a man may possess mouth and leg, he happens to be dumb or lame.

The necessity for the instruments of action as apart from the sense organs will be felt that the experiential perception does not take place only with respect to indeterminate perception and determinate perception which come to a person only with respect to the sense organs and the internal organs. But it should be noted that among the internal organ, there is one ego which has control over all the actions of the body through the vital air. It is only when the activities of the body are roused the sense organ and the other internal organs do their function resulting in the experiential perception. In other words the harmonious co-operation of the instruments of action is also required to have experience.

Also the distinction between the views of the Sankhyas and the Saiva Siddhantins with regard to the potency of action should also be noted. The Sankhyas say that the individual self is of purely cognitive potency and that in the presence of that self the various inert objects will begin to move and perform actions. If it be so since the presence of the self is in all places even a pot which is inert must be moving but it is not so. According to Saiva siddhanta the volitional potency qualifies only a sentient beings not the insentient things like the intellect. The inert things like the internal organs etc., are only the manifestors which reveal the presence of the potencies in the individual self.

Also the distinctive use of the Naiyayikas and the Saiva siddhantins with regard to the evolvent should also be noted. The Naiyayikas say that the instruments newly produce the potency of cognition etc. They do not hold the view that they are the manifestors of the potencies that are inherent in the individual self. According to them the effect is newly created. Further a quality should be inherent in the thing which it inheres. We cannot call that attribute which takes its origin and is destroyed later on as the quality of the thing. The English term 'quality' is used to denote the in-

herent quality i.e. the guna of a guni and the word attribute is used to denote anything that may qualify or used as an adjunct to a thing. According to the school of Saiva siddhanta the potencies of cognition and volition are inherent to the individual self. But they are prevented from beginningless time by the spiritual darkness from manifesting themselves and the individual self appears to be inert like a stone. But the functions of the sense organs and the instruments of action are to manifest such potencies by removing the effects of the spiritual darkness to a certain extent. In darkness when there is the presence of the light the objects will be visible. In the absence of light they will not be visible. On that account we do not hold that the objects have their origin and destruction. Similarly during the time of bondage when the individual self is under the influence of the spiritual darkness the potencies of cognition and action will manifest themselves when there is the presence of the evolvents. In their absence they will not manifest. On that account the potencies cannot be said to have origin and destruction.

Even when the eyes are wide open and the thing is constantly seen by a person, the experience seems to be momentary. As all the instruments are present without any of them being absent it may be enquired into how the momentariness of the experience is caused.

The cause is that the activities of the internal organs mind citta, ego and intellect occur in a particular order instantaneously one after another in order to have the apprehension of the object. Hence the various ideas and the consequent experience appear to be momentary in a particular order as in a regular procession. From this the view of the Buddhists that the knowledge is momentary, is also refuted.

Subtle elements : The subtle elements have their origin from the tamasa aspect of the ego and are five in number. They are the sound, the touch, the form, the taste and the smell. These five subtle elements form the loci of the two kinds of organs the sense organ and the instruments of action and provide the strength for them to perform their respective functions. They act like vehicles for a man who drives it. Hence the appropriateness of the fact of their origin from the tamasa aspect of the ego. When the instruments are dealt with the bodily constituents are to be their loci. But when the subtle elements are taken up they are also said to be the loci of the same organs. So there

is possible question whether these two statements are consistent. The answer is that they are both consistent. The subtle elements act as loci for the organs even as the vehicle, whereas the constituents of the body act as their loci even as the earth is the support of a man who drives the car.

The sound which cannot be distinguished with respect to its qualities as being hard or soft, is called the sound only (sabda tanmatra). It exists in a subtle form without revealing its particular forms which are implied in it. The touch is the subtle form of the air. It has in it the elements of sound and touch in an implied form without revealing any of their particular forms as being hot, cold or cool. This subtle state may be called the touch only (sparsa tanmatra). Similarly the subtle elements form, taste, and smell include in them the subtle nature of the element which has been dealt with already and they are called tanmatras of form etc.

The following question may occur to a person with regard to the derivation of the five gross elements. It is said that the five gross elements have their origin respectively from the five subtle elements and that the five subtle elements have their origin from the tamasa aspect of the ego. What is the necessity for the interposing of the subtle elements in between the gross elements and the tamasa aspect of the ego ; instead, is it not proper to derive the gross element directly from the tamasa aspect of the ego. The answer is as follows:

The gross earth has the five qualities sound, touch, form, taste and smell ; the gross water has the four qualities sound, touch, form and taste, and so on. It is invariably observed that the qualities that are explicit in the gross form which is the effect should be present in its cause in a subtle form. The tamasa aspect of ego stands along without possessing the qualities sounds, taste, etc., as in the water of the egg of the peacock which has the five colours implied in a subtle form in it. Hence the subtle elements are posited inasmuch as they contain the five qualities in a subtle form in the order in which they are found in a gross form in the gross elements.

The difference between the subtle elements called tanmatras and the gross elements is something like that which exists between the sprout and the tree which it puts forth. That is the qualities exist in a subtle form in the cause, whereas they exist in a gross form in the effect which is evolved.

These subtle elements or tanmatras have their origin in order and the qualities of them increase in order. They are named by the special quality which is added to the common one. Thus the subtle element of fire is called the tanmatra of form. Form is the special quality of that element whereas sound and touch which are present even in the subtle element sky and air are called the common qualities. The appropriateness of such nomenclature should be known.

The nature of the quality and the qualified

In the foregoing section it is said that the subtle elements are of the form of the quality only without revealing its particular nature whether it is hard or soft in sound, whether it is hot, cold or cool in the nature of touch, etc. But it is said that the sky etc., which have their quality sound etc., will have their origin from the gross elements. In other words the cause is in the form of quality, whereas the effect is in the form of the qualified. This is inconsistent, one may ask. This question arises from the inability to remember that all the external world from intellect onwards to the earth, is of the form of quality. The external world is of the form of sattvika, rajasa or tamasa. Sattvika has the characteristics of illumination, calmness and pleasure. Rajasa has the characteristics activity, passion and sorrow. Tamasa has the characteristics of confusion, dullness and indifference. Of such a world the cause is known to be the primal prakṛti. So it is known that the world of our experience is of the form of the quality. When many men are enlisted, they are called an army. When many trees are considered together, they are called the grove. In a similar manner a substance is only a collection or gathering together of qualities or characteristics and it is not different from its quality or characteristics. Hence the view that a quality is altogether a different entity from a substance, as is being held by the Vaiśeṣikas, is not acceptable to the Sāiva siddhanta. The consistency in positing the gross elements as the effect and the subtle elements as the cause will be seen.

Also it should be seen that the view that a whole is altogether different from its parts and the classification of action, class, difference etc., as different from a thing are not proper. It should also be appreciated that inherence (samavaya) is not different from what is called tadatmya in Sāiva siddhanta.

We have the experience that I have seen a thing and then touched it. Hence from the experience we have to conclude that an object becomes perceived by two sense organs namely the eye and the hand. But we know that eye cannot be aware of the touch whereas the organ of touch cannot perceive the form (colour). Hence it may be concluded that there is a third thing called substance which becomes the object of both the sense organs eye and touch. But it is not so. As it is the general law that the sense organs eye etc., can perceive only their respective objects form etc., we cannot hold that there is a substance other than the qualities perceived. It has no valid means of knowledge and the means of knowledge shown here are strong. Hence the idea of substance should be considered to be the result of erroneous knowledge due to the impression that the same thing has been seen and touched or it must be held that the substance is only the collection of impressions gained through more than one sense organ, and it is called so by courtesy usage. So due to this multiple impression of different senses we cannot hold that the substance exists in addition to the qualities that are perceived by the sense organs. Hence it should be concluded that the various impressions when looked at from the angle of collection is called the substance and when they are looked at from the angle of individual impressions are called qualities. These things are being explained in the Upagamas Pauskara etc. Hence it will be seen that the causal aspect of a thing is called the quality whereas the state of effect is called the substance.

Ether

Ether has its origin from the subtle element of ether which is sound only (sabda tanmatra) in a gross form, and has various kinds of sounds. It allows men and animals to move through and do such other works. In other words, ether does not offer friction to things that dwell in it. The existence of ether will be known by the inference that it is the collection of various kinds of sounds. Its existence is also known indirectly as it allows the movement of a person or thing through it when the impediments like the earth etc., are absent. The usage that the sky is clear or that part of the sky is in conjunction with a bird, may appear to provide perception as the valid means of the existence of sky. But it is not so. There the conjunction with the bird is not of the sky or ether. It is only of the light rays that are in conjunction with the bird. Ether is an invisible element.

It may be asked why should not ether be held to be an object of perception since it is seen by the eye as something blue in colour. It is not so. The blue colour which is seen at a distance is not seen when we get nearer. So the perception is an erroneous one and the cause for such a perception lies only in the light alone.

Now it may be suggested that ether is the absence of the other elements such as the earth etc., and its existence need not be derived from the fact of allowing a substance to move through it. It is not so. In satkarya vada we have explained how the absence of a thing is something characteristic of the thing even like its presence. So it will be limited to the substance, but in the case of the ether it is everywhere, allowing things to move through it freely without any friction. So ether should be identified only with respect to its characteristic of allowing things to move through without any friction.

It may be questioned how the absence of a substance will become its nature. In answering this question we should bear in mind that as per the school of the logicians the absence of a thing is the cause for its invisibility, but in Saiva Siddhanta it is the invisibility itself of a thing that is its absence. Hence it will be clear that the invisibility of a thing is its nature and its nature should be confined to the thing itself.

All the wordly things are of the nature of the three qualities sattva, rajasa and tamasa. A thing becomes gross and visible owing to the predominance of the rajasa and becomes subtle and assume the form of potency due to the predominance of tamasa. In this form it is not visible and this invisibility itself is named its absence. The absence is only the nature of the thing and to speak of it on its cause is against the principle of parsimony ; in other words to assume a cause for its invisibility other than the predominance of tamasa, which the logicians do, is unwarranted.

Again a thing changes itself from a subtle form to a gross form owing to the predominance of rajasa. The cause for its assuming the gross form is the predominance of rajasa. So these two states, the state of visibility and the state of invisibility are not the opposites, and they can exist in the same substance. This can be understood from what has been formulated as satkarya vada.

The significance of the statement that there is no pot on a particular locus, is as follows : The pot which can be visible owing to its

conjunction with the locus is not to be seen with the relationship of the quality and the qualified. When we say that there is no hare's horn, it means that the horns that are visible on the head of an ox or cow, in the relationship of inherence is not visible on the head of a hare, in the relationship of the quality and the qualified. When we say that a pot is destroyed it means that a pot which was seen in a gross form due to the predominance of the quality of rajasa, has become invisible because of the predominance of tamasa by assuming a subtle form. When we say that a pot has had its origin it means that the pot which was in a subtle, causal form has become visible in a gross form due to the predominance of the rajasa. So the substances which are in the form of effects are called false ones because they will not be visible during the times of their existence. The same substance is called destructible because it is visible during the present time due to the predominance of rajasa and was and will be invisible due to the predominance of tamasa during the past and the future. Hence these usages that a thing is false or that it is destructible are not due to anything other than the above concepts. These ideas are being experienced by us.

Even if the absence is taken to be an entity different from the thing existent, it will not be proper to call ether to be the absence of the other elements, earth etc. The reason is explained as follows ; When we speak of the absence of a thing, it was to be classified into any one of the following four kinds :—

the eternal non-existence, the prior non-existence, the posterior non-existence and the mutual non-existence of earth etc. We cannot say that ether is the eternal non-existence of earth etc., for it will exist only in the locus of those elements. But ether exists everywhere and allows things to pass through without friction. We cannot say that it is the prior non-existence of the same elements, for when the earth etc., originate, the prior non-existence of them vanishes and cannot allow things to pass through. We also cannot assert that it is the posterior non-existence of the elements, for the posterior non-existence cannot allow things to pass through without friction. Hence we have to say that it is the mutual non-existence of earth etc. The mutual non-existence of a pot is to be found in a cloth. In the same manner, the mutual non-existence of the four elements earth etc., is only the ether and it is improper to speak of its non-existence or absence.

With respect to the nature of sound, we speak of its hard and soft nature. Also it does not co-exist with its support air for example but has its origin and destruction while its support or mainstay lasts. In this respect it may be compared to the waves or ripples that rise and fall on the surface of water. Also sound reveals itself not only at the place of its origin but also at some other place which is the destination of its travel. For these reasons some people think it is a substance rather than quality. But it is not so.

The quality of hardness or softness may mean only the intensity of its loudness or otherwise. Such qualities are appropriate to the qualities like smell etc., not to the substances. Even when we say that iron is hard or gold is heavy, the hardness and heaviness are due to their qualities, not to the substances as they are. Hence the reasons advanced prove only that it is a quality, not a substance.

The reason for holding the sound to be a substance is said to be its rise and fall in an area of its support without lasting till its support lasts. This is untenable, for an existing pot becomes visible when there is the presence of light and is invisible when there is darkness. In the same way sound manifests itself when there are the activities of the tongue, lip etc., and when there are no such activities, it does not manifest itself. So there is no origin or destruction of the sound. Hence the reason advanced for proving it as a substance is alsified or shown to be erroneous.

The sound which is raised by the beating of the drum does not even travel through the air to the ear of the hearer. The vibration caused by the beating gives rise to the vibration in the particles of air which are in contact with the material and that gives rise to the vibration in the particles of air that are in the neighbourhood and so on, like the wavy motion that has been given rise in the middle of a tank reaching its bank, causing similar motion in the contiguous areas. What we mean is though the sound appears to travel from the point of origin to the ear of a person who hears it, yet there is no such motion of a single phenomenon, but the wavy motion or vibration is caused in the contiguous areas of the medium owing to the cohesive force of the particles concerned; and there are several waves. It means that there are a number of rises and falls of the sets of molecules. Though the substance which gives rise to quality of the first sound,

is the leather covering the drum, yet the substance that is qualified by the other sounds that are raised in order is only the parts of ether.*

The nature of the substance and its qualities has been already dealt with. The difference between the ordinary sound caused by the elements and the speech sound is also dealt with earlier. These things should be borne in mind by the disciple.

Air : Air has its origin from the tanmatra of sparsa, which has for its constituent parts the two qualities sound and touch. Its function is to be always moving, the effect of which is the collection of things. This element functions also within the physical body in the form of vital air etc., which are ten in number. It is helpful to all the living beings in enabling them to perform activities such as standing, sitting etc.

Fire : It has its origin from the tanmatra of touch, which has as its constituents, sound, touch and colour. It prepares things to have different taste, touch, colour etc. It is used as the three kinds of fire agavaniya, karugapadya and Dhaksnagni in the Vedic rites and the fire of Siva in the rites pertaining to Saivagamas. It also enables living beings to digest their food in the form of the fire of bñdu. Thus it is useful in a number of ways to men and other living beings.

Though the colour is not visible in hot water, we have to suppose that it is invisible. Though the touch of a lamp is not usually felt, it is known when felt. The fire illumines. So it may be felt that it is proper to attribute the cause for its origin as the sattvika aspect of the ego. But when we compare it with the sense organ of eye, the sense perceives whereas fire is perceived. So it is better to attribute for its cause of origin the tamasa aspect of the ego which has sattvika predominantly in it.

Water : It has its origin from the tanmatra of taste which includes in itself the other three aspects viz., sound, touch and colour. Its chief purpose is to dissolve things and enable the living beings to sustain themselves. Mist and snow are also to be classified under water, for they have what is called the touch of coldness. They seem to be hard because of their solidification.

*In modern science ordinary Sound waves have for their medium the atmospheric air. It is only for movement of the electro magnetic waves that is being broadcast the medium is ether.

Earth : It has its origin from the tanmatra of smell, which has in it the other four aspects, sound, touch, colour and taste. Its chief function is to be the main support of things. Even in the physical body the four elements earth, water, fire and air are to be found in the form of bone, blood, perspiration etc. In all the nerves the element of sky is present and the nervous system is considered to be a transformation of ego.

The quality or attribute of sound is in the form of echo in the sky, in the form of hissing in air enabling us to infer its movement. It is to be found in the other three elements also denoting their existence and function. So it is not proper to believe that the sound is the characteristic of ether alone as the logicians hold.

In the case of the quality of touch, air and earth have that quality which is neither warm or cold. Fire has the touch of heat and water has the cool touch. The colour of fire is that of light, whereas the colour of water is to be described as unmanifest whiteness and the earth has all the five colours such as white, red, etc. So far as taste is concerned it exists in water in the form of sweetness, whereas its existence in the earth may be classified into six kinds, sweet, salty etc.

There are people who hold the view that air originates from Ether, fire from air, water from fire and earth from water. It is held as an invariable principle that the qualities of the effect must also be found in its cause. So the five qualities smell etc., that are found in the earth should be found in its cause water, which is considered to be its cause. For the same reason, even the other elements fire etc. should have all the five qualities. But it is not so. Hence the theory that the elements have their origin in the previous element in order is an erroneous one.

But it may be asked whether this opinion is not inconsistent with the expressions of the Vedas that proclaim the origin of the elements as held above and also the Tamil hymns which confirm what is said by the Vedas.* Here we have to observe the following method of interpretation. The view expressed above is in accordance with what

*Taittiriya 2, says 'From the Atman ether has come out, from ether air, from air fire etc.' and Saint Sambandhar repeats the idea in the reverse order that the earth dissolves in water, water goes into fire etc., in the 7th st., of the hymn in praise of Tirumaraikkadu.

is said in Sivagamas. Lord Siva is the only author of both the vedas and Sivagamas. So they will not contradict. If in some places an apparent contradiction is felt, we should note the essence of one of them so that there is no contradiction. When two scriptural statements appear to be contradictory, according to the strength or the weakness of the statements, one statement will be interpreted directly and the intention behind the other is determined and adopted. The chandogya upanisad speaks of the three elements fire, water and earth and states that the whole world consists of these three elements. But Taittiriya speaks of all the five elements from ether onwards and states that the whole world is of the form of these five elements. Here the two statements appear contradictory. But Badarayana discusses these two statements in his work on Brahmasutra in Viyad adhikarana and concludes that what is said in Taittiriya should be considered as a strong one and be taken as representing the true position, whereas what is said in chandogya should be interpreted so as not to contradict with that.

Among the two versions that the elements proceed from one another and that they have their origin from the tanmatras, it may be asked, which version is to be taken as it is and which version is to be interpreted so as to convey the intention behind it. From the above discussion it is clear that the five elements have their origin from the five tanmātras. So this is to be taken as the most important version and the other version that the ether has its origin from Brahman, that air originates from ether etc., should be interpreted so as to convey the meaning, which is true.

The interpretation is as follows : It is well known that the five tanmātras sound etc., has for their presiding deities Sadasiva, Mahesa, Rudra, Vishnu and Brahman respectively. So the term Brahman or Atman refers to the sound only (*sabda tanmātra*) which he presides over. So the version that ether has its origin from Brahman will mean that ether has its origin from sound only (*sabda tanmātra*). When we read that ether has its origin from Atman the word Atman means paramatman by the principle of a part of the name will denote the whole name. Atman means paramatman, i.e., Sadasiva, which means the sound only. The intention behind saying that air has its origin from ether is that air originates from the touch only (*sparsa tanmātra*) which consists of touch and sound of which the sound is the cause of the ether. Hence in that expression ether denotes its

cause sound, and again sound denotes the touch only which has for its constituent attribute the sound as well. Similarly for the other expressions that fire has its origin from air etc., correct interpretation is given. There air indicates its cause which is touch only. That again indicates colour only, which has for its constituents colour, touch and sound. That this is the interpretation given by Srikantha also, should be known from the quotation of the puranic expression shown there.

In chandogya it is said that waters have created food, but the word food does not mean food ; it means only the earth. This is agreed to by all schools of vedic scholars. Hence in the interpretation of vedic expressions, it is proper to decipher the strength or weakness of the expression and to give the interpretation in such a manner as to convey the correct intention behind the expression.

Thus the thirty six evolvents, their classification as pure, mixed and impure etc., will be clearly understood from the above exposition. The involution of the various evolvents take place in the same order as they have been evolved.

Classification of evolvents

The thirty one evolvents from the earth to kalā are to be classified into four kinds, as the outer most instruments, the outer instruments, the inner outer instruments and the inner instruments.

Of these the five elements and their five causes called tanmātras (essences) are the outermost instruments ; the sense organs and the organs of action, which are ten in number are the outer instruments, the internal organs mind etc., are the inner outer. The seven vidya tattvas Raga etc., are the inner instruments.

Also these evolvents are classifiable into three kinds, the common, the individual and the common and individual. The evolvents in the form of locus or worlds are common to all the selves in providing them with experiences. So they are the common evolvents. The subtle body or the linga sarira which consists of eight constituents is separate for each individual self and provides experience to them individually. Hence it is called the individual one.

Here it should be known⁷ that the body which has eight constituent parts is of two kinds, the subtle body and *para deha* or more-subtle. Of these two the subtle body is made of the three internal organs (mind, ego and the intellect) and the five essence (subtle elements). This information is to be found in the Agama kālottara, Mrgendra etc., given as the eight constituents of the *paradeha* of thirty one tattvas as the elements, the essences or tanmatras, the sense organs, the organs of action, the internal organs, the evolvent of quality, the primal prakriti and the vidya tatvas kala etc. Here eight is taken to be eight groups.

There are some people who will call this *paradeha* as the subtle one and regard the five pure evolvents Nāda etc., as *paradeha*. This is contradictory to what is given in Kalottara ; there is no valid means of knowing that the other evolvents are also included in the five essences and the three internal organs. If it be held that the other evolvents are included in the five essences and the three internal organs, for the same reason, it may be held that these eight constituents are included in the five gross elements which will show the impropriety of the separate mention of those eight constituents. Also the pure evolvents stand separate while aiding to activate the vidya tattvas and they do not function as a body to Sakalas (the selves that are bounded by all the three means of bondage). For these reasons it must be known that that view is not a proper one.

It should be known by the principle of propriety that the effects of bindu (pure maya which are called baindava) will not stand in such a way as to be known by us. But the gross nāda which causes the determinate perception will mingle together with what is called *paradeha* and will be seen within. This has been shown when we dealt with the effects of bindu as speech sounds.

The evolvents that function as the gross body from the locus for not only the individual experiences but at the same time is being experienced by the relatives, wife and others as an object of experience like the paste of sandal and the garland of flowers. Hence they belong to the classification, common and individual. If it be so, it may be asked what the valid means of knowledge is to believe that there is what is called a subtle body as different from the gross body which we see. We shall answer the question.

We have experience in the state of dream even though the gross body is devoid of activities. Even in that state, experience cannot take place without the activity of the body. So it is to be concluded that it is the subtle body that enables the person to have the dream experience. Umapati in his Sankalpa Nirakaranam says, while refuting the school of Maya vada, 'The experience in the state of dream and in the wakeful state is the result of a person's deeds : it is not proper to attribute falsity to them'. There is no valid reason to hold the dream experience as false. Hence it should be known that experience in dream is a true one.

Also the necessity for the existence of a subtle body is felt as it is held that the pervasive self is held to go to the other words and come back during its transmigration. The next section of this sutra says that 'the self which is pervasive goes after death either to the higher world or to the lower one, and has experiences there. After the experiences there, it comes back to the earth and falls into the germ.'

If it be so, it may further be asked what is the valid means of knowledge for saying that the subtle body is made up of the five essences and the three internal organs. The gross body and the subtle body belong to the same class as they are respectively the main supports for the self to have experience and the concomitant movements in the wakeful state and in the dream state. The difference between them is only that they are gross and subtle respectively. So the gross body which is constituted by the gross elements must have for its cause the subtle body which is constituted by the subtle elements, the essences. Since the internal organs have their locus in the subtle body and cognize the experience that comes to it even as the sense organs have the gross body as their locus and perceive the external objects they are said to be the constituents of the subtle body. The internal organs are with the subtle body like its parts. Thus it will be seen that the constituent parts of the subtle body are not only determined by verbal testimony but also by inference.

The syllogistic form of the inference is as follows :

The subtle body is constituted by subtle elements and the internal organs, for it is the locus of the self for its experience and for its movement ; like the gross body which is the locus of experience and movement of the self, being made up of the gross elements and the external

organs. The thirty one evolvents from kala to the earth are only the instruments for the self to have its experience, but still as they are always with the self and different for different selves they are called by the collective name *paradeha* by the courtesy usage. It is not the body of the self in the sense in which the gross body and the subtle body are called bodies.

Third Section

The second section established that the characteristic of the supreme Being is that it is the efficient cause of the five cosmic functions. It refuted the *prima facie* case that if the supreme Being is the efficient cause for the reincarnation and the various experiences of the individual selves, it should be merciless and partial. It has cited the illustration of the ruler of a country who dispenses justice to his subjects as per their deserts. Similarly the individual selves reincarnate and have their experiences according to their deeds.

Since the supreme Being is called the prime Agent of dissolution in this school of thought, to describe Him as the agent of five cosmic functions will be improper. It may be said that the Agency of dissolution is a characteristic of distinction and it is used in a continuative sense and not in a restrictive sense. But the Agency of dissolution becomes a characteristic of distinction only when it is proved that the same self which has been dissolved will be reincarnated. But there is verbal testimony to the following effect even as ether that is confined to a pot becomes one with ether outside when the pot is broken, so also the individual self with its embodiment becomes identified with the cosmic self when the body is destroyed. This speaks of the identity of the individual self with the cosmic self and so the individual self will not reincarnate. The verbal testimony which speaks of the *vidya* of *pancagni* will be taken to be figurative and not to be a valid testimony for the revelation of Truth. Also according to *satkaryavada* there is no evolution to a thing that is non-existent. So in the case of reincarnation there should be some common element which continues from body to body. We don't see that common element. Further the individual self is taken to be pervasive, so a pervasive thing should have a common support to have what is called transmigration. But we don't see such a support. Even if that support is supposed to exist that support itself will be enough and the new bodies will be in excess. Also if there is continuous reincarnation

the individual self should be aware of its experiences in its previous birth. But such awareness is not to be seen. If the deeds good and evil are exhausted by experience of their effects, then there will be no deed which will enable the individual self to fall into a new womb. For all these reasons, we find no evidence to suppose that an individual self which was dissolved is being reincarnated. Hence the characteristics of being the primal agency of dissolution fails to be distinctive used in a continuative sense. So the description should be taken to be an attribute which has restrictive sense of the supreme Being. Hence the definition of the agent of dissolution as being the author of five cosmic functions is applicable only in a general way not in a special sense as indicated in the previous sections. These objections are raised by one of the outer schools of thought, Kreedā brahma vadin. These objections are refuted and the definition of the primal Being is strengthened by this, the third section.

The proposition of this section is : It is the individual self that is subject to the process of rebirth.

The reasoning : for, evolution or rebirth is possible only for that which undergoes evolution and dissolution in a continuous circle, in other words, for that which exists eternally.

But it may be questioned that all the objections raised above are not covered in the above statement. The following illustration covers such questions as are not covered by the proposition and the reasoning.

Illustration 1 :

The verse explains the experience of rebirth attributed to the individual self. When this body of eyes, ears and other organs, perished, the subtle body which does not perish gives rise to the gross body in the form of *bhūta-sāra-sarira*, a body of elemental essences. In this body the individual self passes and has experiences in heaven. After the experiences in heaven, the individual self forgets how with the body of elemental essences it passed to the heaven and the experiences there. This is just like forgetting the things seen in the waking state while undergoing the state of dream. Then there is a desire which impels the self to the form of rebirth which is caused by the remaining deeds which were experienced in the previous birth. It was already indicated in the form of a vision at the death of

the previous body. Hence on account of the consequences of the two fold work which still remains to be experienced, the self in the form of the subtle body passes into the womb appropriate to that form of rebirth.

In the above description of the rebirth it is said that the gross body is the effect produced by the subtle body. The gross body is generally considered to be the effect of the five elements, but those five elements have for their causes the tranmatras. Hence since the subtle body consists of those tranmatras and belong to the same class there is no contradiction in saying that the gross body is the effect of the subtle body.

In the first creation it was only the subtle body that was created at first and then the gross bodies are created in accordance with the two deeds that are caused by the subtle body. Hence it should be known that the gross body is the effect of the subtle body. It is because of this fact that the gross body is said to be of the nature of the five elements. In Sivajnana Siddhiyar also this fact has been mentioned in a number of stanzas. In stanza 36 of the second sutra, Siddhiyar says that when the gross body which is made of the elements perished, the subtle body turns into the suitable bodies for the experience to be held in heaven or hell. In stanza 10 of the sutra 11, it is said that the subtle body is the cause for the gross one. Again in the stanza 15 of the sutra 2 it says that the subtle body is the first cause of the gross body.

Some people take the idea that the subtle body is the cause of the gross body as the opinion of some alien school of thought as it is well-known that the gross body is of the nature of the five elements. It is unwarranted for the above reasons. From the expression of the illustrative verse that the subtle body gives rise to the body of elemental essences, two objections may be taken to have been answered. The first is that the fact of reincarnation is not against the principle of satkaryavada and that the subtle body is the support of the pervasive individual self in its passage from one world to another. The need for a gross body in addition to the subtle body is stressed by the fact that the gross body is the embodiment for gross experiences, whereas the subtle one is for the subtle experiences. Also it should be known from what is said in Siddhiyar that the gross bodies are many

whereas the subtle body is one even as many ornaments are shaped from the same material gold or silver. Even as the same root produces many shoots as required so also the same subtle body produces a number of perishable gross bodies. The same fact is also established by citing the example of the unchangeable moon with its waxing or waning phases. In the illustrative verse the passage and experience in heaven will equally apply to those with regard to netherland. The objection that if the same self is considered to have reincarnation it should have awareness of the previous birth is also answered by citing how the individual self in the state of dream forgets all about its experiences in the wakeful state.

A newly born child puts forth sufficient efforts to suckle mother's milk which is essential for its survival. If it be held that such a desire and effort are granted by God to the child, we have to postulate a privilege on the part of the young child, for the same awareness is not conferred by God on insentient things. So it should be supposed that God will enable the young child to retain the memory of suckling in order to make it live.

This stanza speaks of three changes in reincarnation. They are the change in the embodiment, the change in the locus of having experience and the change in memory. The expression in the stanza that the self will fall into the womb being impelled by the mind according to the deeds, should be taken to mean the self falls into the womb which was indicated in the form of a vision at the time of the death of the previous body in accordance with the remaining deeds. This answers the last objection raised by the alien school and it should be supposed that in the heaven etc., the experiences of the individual self are limited to those deeds other than the remaining one according to which the self is impelled into the womb. The object of the author in describing the re-incarnation in terms, that the self proceeds to heaven, forgets and then falls into the appropriate womb in the form of the subtle body, is to indicate the nature of the vidya by name Pancagni described in the Vedanta. Hence the vidya of Pancajni will be expounded briefly.

Pancajni vidya (The meditation of five fires)

The individual self which had performed the special rites such as performing sacrifices will go to heaven after casting off the gross.

body with the subtle body. There it will have the body of elemental essences, live along with Gods and enjoy the experiences that are due to the good deeds performed. After the experience, it will come back to the earth in order to acquire new deeds with the necessary remaining deeds. When it casts off the body of elemental essence, it comes to the cloudy region with the subtle body. Then it mingles up with drops of rain, reaches the earth and enters into the rice plant etc. When rice is turned into food it reaches the body of the father and becomes modified into semen. With the semen it enters into body of the mother and comes out as a child with the gross body. Here the loci of such a living being are (1) the heaven, (2) the clouds, (3) the earth, (4) father and (5) mother. These five places are imagined to be five sacred fires and the self is the offering made into it. This is a kind of meditation prescribed in the concluding portions of the Vedas and is called *panjagni vidya*. This meditation is concerned only of the selves that perform good deeds, reach heaven and come back to the earth. There is no such invariable rule for the living beings that perform evil deeds. They may go to the netherlands and come back, but it may be reborn on the earth itself.

There are some who interpret the stanza to mean that after enjoying the experiences in the heaven or suffering painful experience in the lower worlds the self immediately falls into the germ of the future birth as speedily as the mind. But it does not invariably happen. The second sutra of *Sivajñana Siddhi* says in stanza 37 that 'a self which leaves the gross body may be born again immediately catching a womb; or by virtue of evil deeds it may lie like a stone senseless for a duration of time and after that interval may fall into the hell and experience the fruits of the evil deeds. All such selves will take a new body as per its deeds'.

So the above interpretation of the words of the stanza is contradictory to the verbal testimony such as one shown.

Illustrative Verse No. 2:

The verbal testimony which compares the death of an individual to the ether enclosed in a pot and says that as the pot is destroyed the ether within becomes identified with the ether outside is a proper one. So also when the individual self leaves the gross body, it becomes one with the Supreme Spirit, Siva. There is no reason to

consider such a verbal testimony as figurative. Hence its true interpretation should be given if possible. When such a question is asked a proper answer should be given. Hence the following illustrative stanza. For the self's nature of departure from the gross body, it is not proper to use the analogy of ether in a pot mingling with the ether outside. There are other analogies which are often given in scriptures. They are the snake sloughing its skin, of the dream state, and of the yogin entering other men's bodies. The example of the ether in a pot which rarely occurs is an analogy of the way of the individual departing from the subtle body thus becoming one with the Supreme.

From this stanza we understand that not only the analogy of the ether enclosed in the pot but also other analogies are given in scriptures. So a proper consideration of the import of these analogies lead one to the following conclusion. The analogy of the snake's slough, the dream state where the individual self leaves the gross body and enters into the subtle body which is also called the body of dream, and also the analogy of the yogin entering into the body of others are intended to illustrate the nature of the individual self while leaving the gross body and assuming some other gross body such as the body of elemental essence. The analogy of ether in a pot is given to illustrate the fact of the individual self becoming one with the supreme Being when it leaves the subtle body. Thus there is no contradiction in the verbal testimony so far as the analogies are concerned. Also the inference which is given in this section gives the valid reason for knowing how reincarnation of the individual self takes place as per the more common analogies given in scriptures. Hence it is doubtless that even the world of intelligent beings has their origin from the agency of dissolution like the insentient beings that involve in it. So the appellation, the prime agent of dissolution gives the attribute of distinction without any restrictive sense. Thus the characteristic of being the agent of five cosmic function becomes the flawless definition of the prime agent of dissolution mentioned in the first aphorism.

In the previous stanza dream is mentioned as an illustration to show the change in awareness ; the same illustration is used in the present illustrative verse to show the change in embodiment. Hence there is no question of repetition.

St. 35 of the general section of Sivaprakasam says that the individual selves while in reincarnation may have four kinds of appearance, origin, seed, root etc., called utbijam, origin from perspiration, soil etc., called Svetajam, origin from eggs called andajam and origin from the womb, called Jarujam. The gross bodies are divided further into seven kinds the plants, those living beings that move on their bodies, those that live in water, those that fly in air, those that walk on four legs, human beings and the divine beings. These origins are further expanded into nineteen, fifteen, ten, ten, ten, nine and eleven hundred thousand kinds, the total being eighty four kinds in all.

Five Kalās

In the ritual portion of the Sivagamas, the five kalas, Nivrtti, pratistha, vidya, Santi and santyatita play an important part. These are the effects of the pure maya and they are supposed to pervade and control the whole sphere of the material world. These Kalas may be compared to the nervous system of the human body by means of which the brain centres control the various parts of the body. The supreme being is supposed to activate these kalas through its potencies. These kalas in their turn activate the material worlds. The material world is supposed to fall into two classes at first, the sound or concept world, and the substance world. The sound world comprises of 51 letters, of the alphabet, 81 words and 11 mantras. The mantras are as follows: Isana murdha, Tatpurusa vaktra, Aghora hrdaya, Vamadeva ghuya, Sadyo jata murthi, hrdaya, Siras, Sikha, Kavaca, Natrtrya and astra.

The substance world consists of the five kalas, the 36 evolvents and 224 bhuvanas (loci).

In installation ceremony and in wisdom initiation, the other five elements are distributed among the five kalas as follows. All the six elements of the sphere of the material world are called the six adhvas. Adhva means way. As these six elements form the way to reach the supreme after knowing them and transcending them, they are called adhvas.

The kalas are to be meditated on in the shape of the five elements and are said to possess colour, symbol form, root sound (bhijja aksharam) nerve fibre (Nadis), movement, etc. The following distribution is given in the commentary :

1. *Nivrtti kala :*

It consists of the evolvent earth alone. It has the form of the square, the symbol of the diamond and the colour of gold. There are two kinds of root sounds, one is the *pranavakalas*, a, u, m, bindu and Nada and the other the consonantal sounds, l, v, r, y and h. Of these, the root sounds belonging to this *kala* are a and l. It has ida and pingala as its nerve fibres. As movements it has the respiration and the excretion. Of the sense organs it has the nose and of the organs of action the genital organ belongs to this. The object is the smell (*Gandam*). It has the five qualities sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. Of the five states, it has the wakeful one. It has 14 sources (*Yoni bhedas*) such as animal, bird, cow, snake, plant, human being etc. It has the presiding deity creator.

The prime *prakrti* is its locus of involution and the intellect is its locus of sustenance. Of the fifty-one letters which activate the leaders of the *bhuvanas* (*loci*), it has *ksha*.

Of the eighty-one words, it has the last 28 words. Of the mantras it has *hrdya* and *sadyojada*. Thus *Nivrtti kala* includes the evolvent earth and possesses the various things mentioned. It has 108 *bhuvanas* (*loci*).

2. *Pratishtha kala :*

Among the *atma tattvas*, twenty-three above the earth belong to this *kala*. It has 56 *loci*. There are twenty-four letters from la to t. It has twenty-one words, and the mystic spells *siras* and *Vamadeva*.

3. *Vidya kala :*

It has the seven *vidya tattvas* and twenty-seven *loci*. It has seven letters from na to gha. Of the words it has twenty above the forty nine words already stated. Of the mantras two, *sidha* and *aghora* belong to it.

4. *Santi kala :*

It has three evolvents of the pure *maya*, pure *vidya*, *Isvara* and *sadakhya* and has eighteen worlds. Three letters ka, kha and ga belong to it. Of the eighty-one words it has the eleven words

ending in *vyoma vyapi*. It has the two mantras *tatpurusha* and *kavach*.

5. *Santyatita kala* :

It has the last two evolvents *Sakti* and *Siva*, which have fifteen loci on the whole. The sixteen vowels from *a* belong to it. *Om* is its word. It has the three mantras, *Isana*, *astra* and the root spell.

Fourth adhikarana (section)

In the third *adhikarana* the definition of the primal agent of dissolution namely that He is the agent of the five cosmic functions has been strengthened by establishing reincarnation for the selves. But still the following objection may be raised. In the second *adhikarana* it was said that the two deeds of the individual selves function only through the potency of the Lord called authority (*para*, the most high). So it follows that the most high potency of the Lord also perform, the five cosmic functions. Hence it is not proper to give as the definition of the primal being of dissolution alone as the agent of the five cosmic functions. These functions are also shared by the most high potency of the Lord. This objection is overcome by giving the means of valid knowledge for the existence of the instrumental cause for the Lord's actions which is His potency.

Proposition : He is in inseparable union (with His potency). The proposition as worded by *Meykandar* is elliptical without the phrase with His potency. The phrase should be understood (or applied) as it is given in the *sutra* in the words, (*Anaiyin nikkaminri Nirkum*).

There are people who interpret this proposition as speaking of the pervasive nature of the supreme Being. The pervasiveness of the Lord has been dealt with in the first section and it is introduced as a reason in this section, so that interpretation leads us to an error of inference as in the case of the following false argument.

' The hill has fire in it,
because it has fire '.

So such interpretations should be considered as false ones. That the phrase 'from the authority' (*anaiyin*) or 'from his potency'

should be included will also follow from the wording of the corresponding Sanskrit sutras which speaks of *ajñaiya samavetaiya* (the inherent authority).

The term *samavaya* is the same as *tadatmya* (inherence). The import of *tadatmya* has already been explained as 'the distinction perceived in a particular substance, though it is one substantially'. The literal meaning of the term, *tadatmya*, is 'that becoming itself'. So the proposition clears the objection and establishes that the agency of the five cosmic functions is the definition of the Supreme being indicated by the word the prime agent of dissolution, because His potency or consciousness-force is not different from Him and is included in Him. Hence it is not wrong that the characteristic of agency of the five cosmic functions becomes applicable to the consciousness-force as well.

The following is the ground which establishes the non-difference of the Supreme Being from His sentient potency or consciousness force.

Ground: 'For, He is omnipresent being neither one with nor other than (His sentient potency)'. In this statement the ground is furnished only by the expression that He is omnipresent. The other part of the expression is simply a repetition of the content of the proposition. The author resorted to this repetition in order to show the invariable concomitance between the conclusion of the proposition and the reason stated in the ground.

That the Supreme Being is omnipresent has been established in the first section of this aphorism. There the expression is 'He being one with the souls and other than the souls'. So it is given as the reason here in the 4th section. The idea can be thrown into the syllogistic form of inference in the following manner.

The prime Being is in inseparable union with His consciousness-force being neither one with nor other than it, for He is omnipresent. Whatever is pervasive would be neither one nor the other of its potency as in the case of the Sun which is neither one with nor other than its rays.

This is the positive way of establishing the truth by inference. The same truth can also be established in a negative way giving the illustration as follows.

‘ Whatever is not common between one and two will not be pervasive as in the case of a pot ’.

The following illustration is given by the author to establish the invariable concomitance between the reason and the conclusion and thereby strengthen the ground given (a) Because He is omnipresent He cannot be one ; but if you say that He is two He cannot be omnipresent. Whatever exists in whichever place is not independent of His existence. The Supreme Being is like the Sun and its rays. They (the three fetters) are subordinate to Him and we are His servants.

The author has anticipated an objection as follows : even the individual selves and the fetters are also pervasive so far as their effects are concerned. So on the same principle they will also have their potencies and will remain common neither being one with nor being other than their potencies. So it may be questioned what is the difference between the Godhead and the two other principles. This objection is answered by the concluding expression of the illustrative verse, that they are subordinate to Him and we are His servants. Even though these ideas have been expressed previously yet in order to refute the objection that arise here in this connection they have been repeated. This should not be considered to be a case of error. In the first sutra 2b, it was said that *maya* rested on the foot of the Lord and in 3a, it was said that the souls were His servants even in the state of release. These facts should be remembered.

The substance of this section is as follows : As the prime Being is omnipresent, it cannot be one. If it be held to be two it cannot be omnipresent. If the prime Being is not taken to be omnipresent, His dependence of the individual selves and the fetters on the prime Being cannot be explained. Hence it follows that the prime Being itself is omnipresent, being common with its consciousness force by inherence (*tadatmya*) like the sun which is neither one with nor other than Its sunshine, but exists in a common way with His potency. This idea has been clarified and thus the valid means for the existence of the consciousness force has been given.

Here a legitimate doubt may arise. From the content of this section it follows that it should follow immediately the section which

says that two fold works come to these souls by the consciousness force of the Primal one. But this has been placed after the section which deals with the transmigration of the selves which is not proper. Even though the doubt is well grounded, yet the following consideration has weighed with the author.

The first section of the second sutra is the necessary supplement of the first section of the first sutra. The second section of the second sutra is the necessary supplement of the satkarya vada which was expounded in the second section of the first sutra. The third a section of the second sutra is the necessary supplement to the third part of the second section of the first sutra. The fourth section of the second sutra i.e., this section is the necessary supplement of the third section of the first sutra which is restrictive in meaning. In other words, the advaita relation is given as the supplement of the three cosmic changes, the existence and nature of the two deeds are given as the supplement of the Satkarya vada ; transmigration is the supplement of the purpose of creation ; and the existence of the consciousness force is the supplement of the restrictive injunction of the first aphorism.

Here a desire may occur to the disciple to know how the same thing can have twofold aspects by the relationship of inherence and be common to being one and two. We shall explain the nature in a clear manner.

The sun reveals itself as well as the other things. It is known as sunshine or light rays when it reveals other objects and when it reveals itself, it is known as the Sun. So it has two aspects, its potency and itself. In the same manner the primal Being which is pure consciousness is known as Siva when it is self luminous and self revealing and does not reveal the other objects. When it reveals other objects, it is known as its consciousness Force. Thus the primal one has two aspects, Siva and Sakti and remains common to being one and two at the same time. The Sakti aspect is considered to be a quality and the Siva aspect is said to be qualified. This fact is also given by the Sanskrit work Siddhanta Saravali in the second stanza.

Though the potency of fire is one it may be called by different names according to the various effects produced by it. When the potency heats things it is called heat energy and when it is used to

cook food, it is called the energy used for preparing food (adum sakti). In the same manner the consciousness-Force of the primal Being is one, but it is called by various names according to the functions which it performs. Thus it is called by the five names, Para Sakti (Most high potency), tirodhana Sakti (Screening or disciplining potency), Iccha Sakti (potency of desire), Jnana Sakti (potency of cognition), Kriya Sakti (Potency of action). Again when the same consciousness-Force performs the five cosmic functions it is called by the names Isani, purani, arti, vama, murti corresponding to the five mystic spells Isanah, tatpurushah, agohrah, vama devah, sadyojath. Each of these five are further sub-divided into five, four, eight, thirteen and eight parts respectively the total being thirty eight.*

The consciousness-Force is conceived succinctly as performing the three cosmic functions origination, sustentation and dissolution. The three aspects of the consciousness-Force are respectively called janani, rodayitri and harini. It is also considered to have five divisions namely nivrtti, pradista, vidya, santi and santyatita when it activates the six adhvas. In the worship of Siva the same force is said to activate the five elements the sun, the moon and the individual self. In these aspects it is respectively called vama, jesta, roudri, kali, kalavikarani, balavikarani, balapramathani and sarva bhuta damani. In the yogic practice the root sound haum is said to undergo transformation into twelve parts when it rises through susumna (the middle nerve which has the various plexus). Susumna is imagined to extend from muladara to dvadasanta, the various parts of the root sound haum are called kalas and they are twelve in number. The names are madha (a), arkkisa (u), poison (m), bindhu (a drop of liquid), ardha candra (semi circle), nirodhi (a triangle), nada (straight line), nadanta (a straight line having circles on either side) sakti (trident), vyapini (the arms of an obtuse angle one arm remaining vertical and the other inclining to the right), samana (the same in the reverse order), Vyapini (two vertical // lines with drops on either side) and unmana (a circle). The corresponding names in the masculine gender is given to the prime Being which is qualified by these potencies.

* When Manimekalai speaks of the form of spotless kalai of Siva, it is generally understood that Lord Siva has the form of the 38 parts indicated here as 38 kalas.

The potencies have their loci in the pure maya and the loci will have corresponding transformations (vrtti).

These potencies are all involved in the three states of the Primal Being, the absorption, the enjoyment and the authority. The terms laya Siva, anagata Siva, Siva, Santa Nada, Vagisvara, Sakta and Niskala Siva are synonymous. The terms laya Sakti, bindu Sakti, paravaktesvari, and Niskala are synonymous.

The state of laya or the state of absorption is of two kinds, one subtle and the other gross. At the beginning the Supreme Being will be conscious of all things that are involved in the two kinds of maya, the pure and the impure. The consciousness will not be directed towards any particular thing. This is called Parama Siva.

Such a Being wills that the universe should be evolved from the two kinds of maya and cognises them. This aspect of the Supreme Being is called suksma laya Siva or Siva in the state of subtle absorption.

Then with an implied distinction among conation, cognition and volition there is an impression of the consciousness-force on pure maya and the result is subtle cosmic function before the actual functions. This is the gross state of absorption. This state of the pure may be compared to the stage which the trees undergo before putting forth their shoot etc.

The Siva aspect in subtle absorption is called para Nada and the corresponding Sakti aspect is called para Bindu. The Siva aspect in the gross absorption is called apara nada and the corresponding Sakti aspect is called apara bindu. The four aspects para Nadu, para bindu, apara nada and apara bindu are called the niskala (the formless).

The state in which the Supreme Being is ready with all the implements to cause the cosmic functions and yet the cosmic functions have not yet begun is called sakala-niskala. This state is in between the subtle cosmic functions and the gross functions and is common to both of them. So the Supreme Being in this state is common to both form and form-less (sakala-Niskala). The word bhoga means the same thing as sustenance. It is also called Sadasiva.

The authority again is of two kinds the subtle and the gross. The primal Being which has assumed the state of being form and formless actually renders creation in the region of the pure maya by

His mere presence which is called His Will Power. This state is called the subtle authority. The supreme Being in this state is called Mahesa. This is called the state of form. The same supreme Being activates the mixed world and the impure world which are created from the impure maya and prime prakrti respectively. The supreme Being activates the mixed world having anantesa as his medium. It performs world through the trinity who again function being the agents of Anantesa. These states where the Supreme Being functions through His media Anantesa, Rudra, Visnu and Brahma belong to what is called the gross authority. Now it will be seen that the aspects down to Mahesa belong to God (*Sambu paksha*) and those where the Supreme works through the other divinities belong to individual selves (*anu paksha*). Even among the cases of the individual selves Anantesa is to be considered to be a matured self among the class of the Vijnana kalas. Rudra is considered to be a matured self among the paralaya-kalas and visnu and Brahma belong to the class of Sakalas. Among the aspects belong to the case of Gods there is no difference but the distinction is made only with reference to the degree of their activities.

In some places Agamas speak of Sadasiva and Mahesa as individual selves. In those places it should be construed that the Anu Sadasivas (or Vidyasvaras) that attend on Sadasiva and Anantesvara are meant by the Agamas. Opinions differ among the teachers who say differently as follows :

Some say that Visnu and Brahma belong to the category of the individual selves and Rudra, Mahesa etc., upto para Nada belong to the category of the primal Being. There are others who speak of all the nine different forms as belonging to the category of God. Yet there are others who will ascribe the category of prime Being to the absolute and His consciousness-Force alone and reduce all other forms as belonging to the category of the individual selves and so on.

Though the functional forms of the Lord are enumerated as nine in stanza 74 of Sivajñana Siddhi II, yet as per the conclusion of the Sivagamas that there are only seven different aspects belonging to the qualified Siva and there are the corresponding seven aspects of the quality of consciousness-Force. The seven kinds are dictated by the seven special functions of the Supreme Being with regard to the category of the world. The seven special functions are as follows : Of the three functions of prime prakrti origination is the special func-

tion of Brahman, sustentation is the special function of Visnu, dissolution is the special function of Rudra. The two other functions are the general ones common to the other forms as well. Mahesa has got as his special function the screening function and Sadasiva the Bestowal of grace as His special function. The remaining three or four functions are common to them all.

The subtle five functions are the special ones to Apra Nada and the cognition which is the cause of the five subtle functions is the special function of Para Nada or Siva. The para bindu or Sakti, and the apra bindu which are added while ennumerating the nine forms are only the aspects of Sakti or consciousness-Force. So it should be understood that there are seven different aspects of Siva namely Siva, Nada, Sadasiva, Mahesa, Rudra, Visnu and Brahma ; the corresponding seven aspects of Sakti are respectively. Sakti, Bindu, Manonmani, Mahesa, Uma, Lakshmi and Sarasvati. Now a doubt may arise as to how nine different aspects as given in stanza 74 of second sutra of Sivajñana Siddhi can be explained. The reason is that Sakti is born of Siva and Nada is born of Sakti, Bindu is born of Nada and Sadasiva is born of Bindu. Mahesa, Rudra, Visnu and Brahma are respectively born of the couples Sadasiva qualified by Manonmani, Mahesa qualified by Mahesa, Rudra qualified by Uma and Visnu qualified by Lakshmi. This lineal descendancy attributed to the Sakti aspects of Siva and Nada have led to the enumeration of the nine aspects in the first stanza.

This fourth section of the second sutra has given presumption as the means of valid knowledge in the following manner. Since the Primal one cannot be omnipresent without being conceived of as having two aspects, He is considered to be qualified by His consciousness-Force which is neither identical with Him nor other than He.

From this reasoning it will follow that the evil principle, the individual self, maya and the deeds are also qualified by their respective potencies inasmuch as they are also pervasive. But on this account they cannot be taken to be equal to the Primal Being. These potencies are not separate ones but they are inclusive of the respective qualified ones. This is the idea obtained from this section.

The existence of the causal potency :

Even the limited entities like earth, hill, fire, water, jar, cloth etc., are pervasive with respect to the effects that they produce to that

limited extent. So the pervasiveness cannot be accounted for unless they are also conceived to have two aspects, one the causal aspect and the other the aspect of the effect. So the potency of existing in the respective causal form should be attributed to all the objects of experience. Hence every object is to be conceived as possessing its inherent potency to its limited existence. The same reason refutes the views held by Naiyayikas and others who say that there is no entity like the potency of the things.

The potency of fire is with the fire in inseparable togetherness. So it cannot be seen as the fire itself. But still the presence of the potency can be established by the means of presumption. So the existence of potency can be clearly understood. Its existence can be established as follows: When a man touches fire it is felt to be unbearably hot by the finger. After that it is also felt to be effectless when the mystic syllable controlling heat is pronounced by a person. On these two occasions fire exists without any change. So it has to be concluded that there is a potency other than fire which manifests itself when there is no pronouncement and does not manifest when there is pronouncement of the spell. This potency is the cause for the finger being scorched.

Here an objection may be raised as follows. We shall hold that the absence of the pronouncement of the mystic spell also as one of the causes for the fire to scorch the finger and so even though fire etc. exist the absence of the pronouncement does not exist and hence there is no scorching of the finger. This is a simpler way of conceiving things than to admit different potencies for different things and the origin and destruction of such potencies. Let it be so. But when there is an additional pronouncement which has the power to release the effect of the pronouncement we perceive that the fire scorches the finger. In this case the pronouncement of the mystic spell which causes the obstacle to the scorching continues to exist. But still the effect of scorching is felt. To say that the absence of the pronouncement of obstructing spell is also one of the causes for the fire scorching the finger goes wrong here, because there is no absence of the so called cause. So it should be held that the fire has its inherent potency to scorch the finger.

It is a fact that even one among the three causes is absent, the effect cannot take place. The three causes are the material, the instrumental and the efficient cause.

If it be said that the cause intended was the absence of the pronouncement of the obstructing spell which is not conjoined with the pronouncement of the releasing spell, then even without such an absence there is the effect and so mere absence cannot be held to be the cause. If it be so it may be argued that the absence of the obstructing spell is the cause only when it is not conjoined with the releasing spell. In other cases the absence is not held to be the cause. It is not so. When there is no invariable concomitance the definition for the cause itself is not fulfilled. This is evident from the way in which the logician defined the cause of a thing. The cause is that which invariably precedes the effect. The absence of a thing is something which is useless like the apparent nipple that hung from the neck of a goat. So it should be understood that the potency alone is the cause.

Also when the obstructing spell is being pronounced uniformly the fire scorches the finger if the releasing spell is also pronounced. When one inspects what happens under these circumstances, the only possible way of judging the things is that the obstructing spell obstructs the activity of the fire and the releasing spell obstructs the effect of the obstructing spell. There is no other way of explaining the things. Also it is the invariable concomitance that the shortcomings in the effect will not happen without the corresponding shortcomings in the cause and there is no lacking in the cause of the pronouncement of the spell of the obstruction.

From these observations it is concluded by presumption that there are potencies of things which effect the results of such things. Hence the following definition for the cause and effect is more suitable. The cause is the form of potency whereas the effect is the form of manifestation. (*Sakti rupam karanam, Vyakti rupam karyam*).

The definition that what precedes necessarily the effect is the cause and that which necessarily follows the cause is its effect, which is adopted by many schools of thought such as the logicians is useless. It is as useless as the fleshy projection at the goat's neck.

The existence of the conceptual potency

The various things that have their potencies as their cause are conceived by a potency which is made manifest by the language and

this language has its origin from the pure maya. The locus of the collection of the conceptual potencies is considered to be the Nada which is the effect of the pure maya. In that case the following objection may be raised. The alphabetical letters or the words that are formed from such letters or sentences that are constructed from such words may be taken to reveal the various things. But to suppose that there is a conceptual potency other than the alphabetical letters to reveal the things lacks any valid means.

As the sentences are formed from words and the words from the letters, it is known that the letters alone reveal the things and not the words or sentences other than the letters. For example when we pronounce leg the understanding of the thing called leg occurs to the mind, by means of the three letters 'l, e and g'. This is according to the school of thought of the Naiyayikas. When we accept this theory, the question occurs whether those three literal sounds indicate the thing individually or collectively. It is accepted by the Naiyayikas and others that the three things sound, knowledge and action exist for not more than three instants. So the letters which have their origin, sustentation and destruction in order cannot reveal the thing by their togetherness. So it should be concluded that they reveal the thing individually. When we pronounce the letter l, it will not reveal the meaning which is expressed by the word 'language'. If we suppose the pronouncement of the first letter itself will convey the meaning of the full word then it will be unnecessary to pronounce the remaining letters that follow l. Thus the absurdity in holding that the parts of words reveal the meaning is established. Hence it should be concluded that there is what is called conceptual potency which point to the meaning as a whole rather than the words that are pronounced in parts. The conceptual potency is known in Sanskrit as sphota.

The objection may also be raised in the following manner. It is proper to hold that the letters of a word do not stand as a whole and that the letters by themselves cannot reveal the sense. But even though the letters cannot stand as a whole yet the residual impression of the letters pronounced is in the mind and the pronunciation of the last letter of the word together with the residual impressions of the letters already pronounced may be taken to be instrumental in revealing the meaning of the word. The residual impression of all

the letters pronounced so far remains in the mind. So the pronouncement of the last letter of the word has the possibility of combining with all the residual impressions that are in the mind. So when the last letter of a particular word is pronounced it should reveal the meaning of all the words that combine with it in the form of residual impressions. But this is not so. On the other hand it may be suggested that the residual impressions revives the memory and the memory combined with the pronunciation of the last letter will reveal the meaning of the word. Even memory will last only for three instants only even as the sound itself. So it is not possible for the memory also to remain combined with the pronunciation of the last letter.

Also the memory which is raised by the residual impression of the letters pronounced already will pertain to the letters themselves. So it is not proper to suggest that the memory will reveal the sense of the word. From the above argument it will be obtained that the sentences or the words that form the sentences or the letters that are used to form the words, or the residual impression of the various letters pronounced or their memory will not reveal the meaning of the words. So it should be postulated that there is a conceptual potency which is reminded by the pronunciation of the words which reveals the significance of the words. It is the Nada that has such conceptual potencies.

If Nada is to be revealed by the pronouncement of the letters and the Nada reveals the meaning of the words, it may be questioned that at the pronouncement of a single letter Nada is revealed and as Nada is revealed, all the meanings of all the words should be revealed. But the question is the result of ignorance of the way in which Nada is revealed by the pronouncement of letters. In order to counteract the heat of fire a particular spell is pronounced. The same spell cannot counteract the potency of light in the case of fire. In order to counter the potency of illumination, another suitable spell has to be pronounced. So also there are various conceptual potencies in the Nada and these potencies are indicated by different collation of words. So the pronouncement of a single letter or word or sentence will not reveal all the meanings. So the pronunciation of words will limit the revelation of the meaning only to the appropriate things.

In cases where the same word may have different meanings at different contexts, for example 'end', the order of the letters and the number of letters are the same. So one may be curious to know how the different meanings are indicated by the same word. Even though the form appears to be the same while pronouncing the word the stress and intonation will differ to suit the different meanings. Though the letters and their arrangement appear to be identical because of their belonging to the same class yet the letters are considered to be different while a difference in the meaning is intended. Since the letters are different their causes namely the conceptual potencies which are indicated by them are also different. The usage that the English alphabet consists of 26 letters is only with reference to the class of letters. In reality the letters are different when the words constituted by them denote different meanings. It may also be noted that the usage of words differ where there is a difference in the meaning. So the order of such letters points to different conceptual potencies which reveal the different things intended.

There may be a doubt why the letters be considered different instead of considering the words themselves as different because of the difference in the meaning of the words. In the expression, 'the village of the shepherds on the Ganges' we take the words Ganges to mean the flood of the river concerned at first and then to suit the context the same words artificially means the bank of the river by what is called Lakshana vritti. There will be no such usage in grammatical works if we consider that it is only the difference in the words that contributes towards the difference in the meaning. Hence it is proper to consider that the difference in the letters alone that contribute towards a difference in meaning. In the figures of that involves substitution of one word for another it is only the relation of the things that are considered and not the inherent powers of the word to point to the meanings as in the case of synonymous words.

The difference between potency and potentale

It may be questioned here why nada is said to be the potentale and not potency, if there be any difference between the potency and the potentale, it may be clearly explained. Even as the collection of qualities are called by the term qualified (Guni), so also the collection

of potencies is called the *potentale*. The *potentale* is different from the state of potency.

If it be so, a question may arise as follows. It is held that the form of potency is the cause in all cases and the form of manifestation is the effect. It is also held that the language in the form of expression (*Vaikari vak*) is the effect of the conceptual potency which is called *Nada sakti*. If the conceptual potency manifests itself into expression in the form of language, then the two functions attributed to the same thing seems to be improper. It is said that the expression contributes towards the manifestation of the conceptual potency and the potency reveals the thing intended. If the potency takes the form of expression then where is it to reveal the thing also. Here it is to be understood that when the potency becomes manifest as the effect of expression, it only transforms itself partially : so that partial transformation into expression manifests the potency which did not transform into expression and that part of potency which is in the state of cause reveals the thing intended. It is to be understood that when effects are produced by manifestation of potency, it is only a part of the potency that is transformed into the effect : the whole of potency will not transform itself into the effect. Otherwise, the wrong supposition will lead to an absurdity. When *maya* and pure *maya* manifest themselves into their effects they do so only by a part of their everlasting pervading presence. Otherwise they will become perishable being confined to a particular space.

The impression gained that the letters or the words or the sentences reveal the things is due to the apparent immediacy with which the things are revealed as soon as the expression takes place. But it must be understood that the things are revealed only through the manifestation of the conceptual potencies.

Thus the existence of the causal and conceptual potencies pertaining to the things and their expressions respectively and the difference between *potentales* and potencies are to be understood. The terms potency and *sphota* are synonymous.

Third Sūtra

The existence of the self as a separate entity, follows as it is said to be not as the body is known to be mind, as the functions of all the

five senses are known, as there is (a confused) awareness of the dream, as there is no experience and activity in sleep, as it is known when caused to know and as it functions with the body of maya as instrument—This is the Sutra.

Intention : This aphorism establishes the luminosity of the self.

Commentary : The intention behind this aphorism is to establish the existence of the self by inferential realization that it is an entity other than the Supreme and the objective world. The definition of the primal being has been given in the second aphorism with reference to the individual selves in all the four topics. They are respectively (1) the primal Being is one with and other than the selves ; (2) the effects of the two deeds of the selves reach them by the authority of the Supreme ; (3) the Supreme causes transmigration of the selves by His will power and (4) The supreme is inherent with and inseparable from the consciousness-force (or the authority) which illumines the external world so that the selves may know it. This definition of the primal being is strengthened by the establishment of the existence of the self.

The relevance of the aphorism will be clear from the above explanation. The relevance of the topic will be understood from the part of the illustrative verse (4a) ' we are his servants '. The first and the second aphorism established the valid means of knowledge of the Primal one and the principles of fetters respectively. This aphorism makes the realisation of the self clear. Hence the relevance of the chapter will be seen. The propriety of the order of the aphorisms should be understood as follows : As the efficient cause of the universe is of primary importance, it was established in the first aphorism. The material and instrumental causes are related to the subject inasmuch as they too belong to the class of cause ; so their existence and how the universe is caused to function by them were given in the second aphorism. Now the third aphorism established the proof of the existence of the self which is to experience the fruits produced.

Paraphrase : By the six reasons explicitly given and the seventh reason which is implicit in the attribute the body of maya as instrument, it will be realised that there is a self-conscious self in the body other than the various factors of the body, universe and the supreme Being.

(Though the author has worded the aphorism that there is the self in the body making the self as the subject of thought his intention should be taken as if the aphorism is worded as follows : This body has a self which is other than the inexpressible etc or it knows, whatever is devoid of knowledge does not possess an intelligent self even as a jar : thus the author should be supposed to have established the existence of the self by using the negative form of inference. This should be seen in conformity with the first aphorism where the author has established the existence of the primal Being by citing the seen universe as the ground. *

In this aphorism the proposition is one, viz., there exists the self ; but to refute the different schools of thought which hold that the self is unknowable, that it is no other than the physical organism and so on seven different reasons are given. Hence this aphorism is analysed into seven topics. The proposition is one as given above and the seven reasons are also given in the aphorism. It is the purpose of the topics to show the connection between the proposition and the various reasons given and also to show the sequence. (At each topic the proposition acquires a richer meaning).

Of the eight schools of thought that respectively hold that the self is unknowable, that it is the physical organism, that it is the sense organs, that it is the internal organs, that it is the subtle body, that it is the vital air, that it is the supreme Being and that it is the collection of all the instruments, the school of thought that holds the self as the internal organs is refuted in the fourth aphorism by means of the concessional class. The remaining seven schools of thought are being refuted in order in the exposition of this aphorism. The fourth aphorism deals with the definition of the self.

First topic : Of the seven topics the first topic refutes the school of thought called Madhyamika of the four classes of Buddhism. He says that the self is inexpressible (sunya).

* The existence of the self is made known to the disciple by intention which makes him realize himself. The fact that the self is not an object to be known by inference, but it is self luminous should be realised. The wording of the aphorism as it is, reflects the intention of the author. Hence the remark of the commentator is rather a miscarriage of what parimel azhakar has commented under the first kural vena or the para should be considered as an interpolation.

Explanation : The expression of the aphorism that ' there is the self as it is said to be not ' means that there is a conscious principle which after eliminating the various parts of the organism concludes that there is no self. That eliminating consciousness itself is the self.

Commentary : The reason given in the aphorism sounds as follows : ' There is a hare's horn because it is said to be not '. Hence the intention behind the expression is to be made clear by the author. So the explanation of the wording has been given.

The explanation is as follows. Even the Madhyamikas cannot say without any reason that there is no self. They point out that the objects of the senses, the sense organs etc., cannot be identified with the self. So it follows that the self is unidentifiable and hence it is a non-entity. The author's position is that while negating the existence of the self, the negation itself is the result of rational thinking. Hence that principle which thinks is the self.

It must be noted that the argument employed by Meykandar in this topic is similar to the argument of Descartes in formulating his first proposition. His first proposition is : ' I am, because I think (Cogito ergo sum) '. The existence of the self had been established in the first topic of the second aphorism by explaining the meaning of the scriptural expression *advitiya*. The same thing has been established here by inferential reasoning.

If it be said that even that consciousness is a non-entity, the saying is similar to the expression that my mother is barren.

The following illustrative verse strengthens the reasoning used in the explanation by enabling one to eliminate the various parts of the organism.

III 1 (a) There is something which is in union with the body and sense organs and rejects each of them saying, that is not ' I '. That something exists in the form of the five letters a, u, m, bindu and Nada. That is you. You are not maya which assists you in the fettered state to know things even as a mirror assists the eye. You are not even the supreme Being which transcends maya. You are different from both of them.

This verse points to the consciousness which judges things through the internal organs. Hence the author has cited the symbols of the five letters, which will be made clear in the first topic of the next aphorism. The existence of maya and that of the supreme Being have been established in the previous aphorisms. So it is stated here that the conscious self is something other than those two entities. Incidentally this topic introduces the remaining topics of this aphorism as well by referring to them in the illustrative verse.

Second topic : In the first topic it is established that the conscious self is an entity. Now the school of materialists has its turn to intervene. According to this school of thought, the consciousness is none other than the effect of the physical body even as the red colour makes its appearance when betel leaves, nuts and calcium chloride are properly mixed with saliva. When the four elements of the material world are properly mixed and organised, the quality of awareness makes its appearance. It is because of this the word 'I' refers to the physical organism in the expressions, 'I am big', 'I am tall' etc. So this awareness or consciousness need not be held to be a thing, other than the physical organism. This second topic refutes this school of thought. In other words the second topic refutes the conclusion of the materialists who hold that the self is the physical organism or the gross body.

Explanation;

The implication of the expression, 'as the body is said to be mine there is the self' is that there is something which says my head, my leg etc., just as we say my house and my village. That something is different from the physical body.

The intention behind this explanation is that though the attributes of the body are identified with it, by courtesy usage, as in the expression, I am big, I am tall, etc., yet there is none who identifies himself with the parts of the body and says 'I am the head', or 'I am the leg' and so on. People are all agreed in referring to the physical body as something other than they themselves. This is made clear in their expression 'my body', 'my hand', 'my leg' etc., so it should be understood that the consciousness which points to the self is something different from the body.

This explanation also rejects the reasoning based on such rare expressions as Rahu's head where Rahu and his head are identical. There is no Rahu apart from his head. As such expressions are rare they cannot be brought in here.

III 2 (a) It is clear that your wealth is something different from your person. Yet you identify yourself with your wealth and say that it is your wealth. In other words, though your expression points out the separability of your wealth from you, yet you identify your self with your wealth and feel that it is your own self. In the same manner you are also using the expressions such as ' my leg ' ' My hand ' ' my body ' and ' my knowledge '. Yet if you discriminate the thing known from your consciousness, the objects will be seen to be different from yourself. So discriminate yourself from your body which is possessed by you as an instrument of manifestation. Discrimination may be made in the following way. ' When your body is dead, it has no consciousness. So consciousness is different from the body '.

Third topic :

In the second topic it is established that the self is different from the physical body. There the following consideration may occur. Because the body is insentient, it is proper that the sentient self should be held to be other than the physical body. But it is agreed by common consent that the five sense organs know the five objects namely sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. So it may be held true that the sense organs constitute the self. In order to refute this wrong notion, the following explanation of the third reason mentioned in the aphorism is given.

The explanation is : of the five senses each will cognize only the object appropriate to it. For example the ear can perceive the sound and not any of the four other objects. But we are conscious of all the five objects and experience them. So the consciousness which cognizes and experiences all the five objects of the world and coordinates them should be different from each of the five senses. That conscious self experiences these sense objects through the sense organs.

Here an objection may be raised as follows. It may be taken that the five sense organs are five different selves, the continuity of

knowledge as in the expression ' It is I who saw the pot that touches it too ' is the result of their being confined to localised in the same body. This objection is removed by the following illustrative verse.

III 3 (a) The five sense organs have their locus in the same body. But they cannot perceive the sense objects that are appropriate to the other senses. Each sense is limited in perception to its object alone. But the consciousness cognizes the function of each of these senses being impelled by the five literal sounds.* So the consciousness which objectifies these functions must be different from the objects and the senses. In all cases it should be understood that which is conscious is different from those of which it is conscious. In other words, the subject is always different from the objects and the instruments of cognition.

These three topics establish the existence of the self from the experience of the wakeful state.

Fourth topic :

In the foregoing topic the materialists who hold the sense organs as the self were refuted. Then it may be said by the opponent that it is proper to hold the self as different from the sense organs as it knows their different functions and experiences the external world through them. But you yourself hold that the subtle body is at the basis of the senses when they sense their objects (Siddhi, 2, 64). So it is proper to hold that the subtle body is the knower. Eventhough it cannot be seen, it will remain within and will impel the sense organs towards their objects. This school of thought is being refuted in the fourth topic.

The topic is,

' As it knows during the suppression (of the senses) there is the self different from the subtle-body '.

Here suppression means the state of dream in which the five senses are not active by substitution, the state means what happens during the state.

* The five literal sound are, a, u, m, bindu and nada : These are indicated by the expression, subtle letters five by the commentary. These are not to be confused with 'Namassivaya' which are called the gross-letters five.

Here the opponent may say that as we hold that the subtle-body itself is the knower in the dream state, this is a case of fallacy in which the conclusion arrived at is the same held by the opponent. In order to remove this doubt the author gives the explanatory paraphrase which reveals his intention.

‘ In the waking state there is a consciousness which is doubtful whether it has had the dream experience or not : this consciousness is to be held as the self ’.

Thus it is made clear that knowledge in the aphorism is the imperfect knowledge that one has in one’s wakeful state after the dream of what happened in the dream. Dream is experienced in the subtle-body. If that body itself recollects what happened in the dream during the wakeful state, there is no reason why it should feel doubtful as to what passed in the dream state. But it is a different conscious principle that recollects what happened in the state of dream. Since this principle dreamt with the subtle body as the organism and recollected the dream while in the physical body which is different from the subtle one, it is natural that it should have difference in cognition, owing to the difference in the media. Hence it follows that the subtle body does not recollect the dream and it is a different conscious principle that had dreamt in the subtle body as its medium and recollects the dream with a different gross-body as the medium. Hence the question of arriving at the same conclusion as that of the opponent does not occur at all.

The following illustrative verse strengthens this explanation by the analysis of how the individual self reaches the dream state how the dream takes place there and how it goes back to the wakeful state from dream state.

III 4 (a) When the five sense-organs which function in the (gross) body lie quiescent, all external activity being suppressed, you pass duly from that body and assume a different body which is similar (the subtle) and play. And then you change back again. So you are not the subtle-body either :

How the self undergoes the different states of consciousness, the waking, dreaming etc., will be explained in the next aphorism.

This topic establishes the existence of the self by explaining what happens during the state of dream.

Fifth topic :

In the foregoing topic it was refuted that the subtle body was the self. The opponent now agrees with the refutation for the reason that the subtle-body functions only upto the dream state. But the vital air functions even beyond that state. So he says it is proper to hold the vital air, the source of respiration, as being the agent of consciousness by supposing and releasing the sense organs. This fifth topic purports to refute that view.

The proposition is :

As there is no experience of pleasure and pain as well as activity, there is the self (other than the vital air).

That this is the meaning intended by the author will be clear from the explanation of the phrase ' Experience action ' by the author of the secondary as ' Experience and action ' in Sutra 4, 20. The Sanskrit sloka speaks of the absence of experience alone : it is easy to infer that its intention is to add ' activity ' as well from the principle of understanding from what is expressed the related thing implied as well. Those that are ignorant of this real intention will mistake the expression for ' the activity of experience '.

Now the following thoughts may occur. In sleep it is said that there are no experience and activity. Does their absence refer to the physical body or the vital air ? The physical body is not the self, so it is true that the body remains with neither experience nor activity. But if the vital air is referred to, we have after sleep the recognition that we slept without disturbance (quietly). Since there is respiration even in sleep as in the waking state, even activity seems to be present. So to say that there are no experience and activity to the vital air is contrary to what happens. To remove such an objection the paraphrase of the implied statement is given by the author.

In other words, in sleep there is neither pleasure nor pain nor any activity in the body (prakṛti) and when there is no sleep all these things are found in the gross-body, so that which causes the absence and the presence of the experience and the activity in the gross-body is the self : here it should be understood that the cause is the self, which is other than the vital air or respiratory organ, since it also aids the self conscious principle to have the experience and activity.

Prakṛti in the original refers to the gross-body as it remains changless both in the state of sleep and in other states.

There are two views in which different interpretations are given to the term prakṛti. One view is that it indicates the vital air itself as it is changless both when there is sleep and when there is no sleep. Another view is that it referred to citta which is an effect of prakṛti which functions even in sleep. According to them citta is not the self even though it is active even in sleep.

If it be so, the real reason for the absence of experience and activity of prakṛti is the absence of the necessary instruments ; on that account, it is not proper to say that the vital air is not the self. Such an objection is anticipated and in order to answer this objections and to strengthen what is said by way of paraphrase the illustrative verse is given.

The gross-body is the medium through which the conscious self cognises the external world : the self activates the sense organs and the internal organs in order that it may have things manifested so that it may have the experience of pleasure and pain and there is activity in the physical body. But even when there is no experience and activity in the physical body the vital air functions uniformly in the four states, wakeful, dream, sleep and sound sleep. So it cannot be the agent of experience and activity. The agent is something else which makes use of other manifesting instruments and along with them experiences and activates or remain quiet in the absence of their functioning. If that self is active in the body there will certainly be experience and activity. So the organ of respiration which is active in all the four states (Jagra, swapna, sushupti and turiya) cannot be considered to be the agent, for the reason that there are no experience and activity in the material body even though the vital air is active. Carefully consider this point (Āy).

It is to be noted that Siddhi, the secondary, in st. 4 of the third sutra, explains the meaning of this illustrative verse in the words, ' If the respiratory organ is the self, the overall lord, it is not possible that the instruments are inactive even when it exists functioning '. The affirmative statement of the author in the words, ' If the agent is active in the body, there will be experience and activity for the body ' is to stress that the self is something other than the vital air.

In this topic the existence of self is established with reference to the nature that characterise a person in the states of sleep and sound sleep (sushupti and turiya).

Upto this topic the idea that 'you are not the products of maya which you depend upon' (III 1 (a)) has been stressed.

Sixth topic :

In the foregoing topics, the schools of thought upto that which holds the vital air as self are refuted. The opponent agrees that these refutations are correct inasmuch as they deny insentient things as self; there may be other reasons for their refutation. But the Absolute being is sentient. It is proper to hold that that itself is the self. To suppose some other thing as the self lands one in excess. So argues the Brahnavadin. The sixth topic purports to refute the school of thought of the Brahnavadin.

The proposition is :

The self is different from Brahman, for it knows only when caused to know.

The meaning is that the self is devoid of consciousness so long as it is lonely, i.e. in association with the original darkness and is in a state of kevala. But when it is associated with the manifesting instruments such as Kala etc. by virtue of that association, it knows. But for the primal being no such aid is required for it is always luminous. So the self is different from the primal being which is called Brahman.

Then the opponent shifts his position and says that the Brahman has two states, one of the state of nescience and the other the state of liberation. In the state of nescience we suppose that the Brahman requires the aid of instruments : so it is not proper to suppose that the self is other than the Brahman. Now the author in his consideration allows the opponent to have his own say, but refutes him by giving the paraphrase of the reasoning employed so as to bring out a different intention behind it. The paraphrase is :

The self even when in association with the evolutes of maya does not know of itself but requires to be instructed by a released soul through scriptures whereas the prime being is immutably conscious. Hence it is not the primal being.

This means that, even if the opponent were right about the Brahman's occasions of ignorance, there would still be reason to believe that Brahman is not the self, for the self, unlike the Brahman, knows its own true nature only through the vedas and agamas and the instruction of an experienced Teacher.

If it be so, the opponent is supposed to reply that even when the Brahman is in association with the evolutes of maya, the nescience is not removed and the self is aware of the material objects alone. It requires to be instructed by a qualified teacher to realise its own true nature. Even this contention is accepted because of the considerateness and the difference in the cognitive faculty of the two principles even in knowing the worldly objects is brought forth in the illustrative verse :

III 6 (a) : What is that which knows one thing and proceeding to know something else forgets the former ; and which subsiding ceases to know ? It is not perfect Divine consciousness : nor is it insentient. If the seer of truth concentrates on this point, it is the self which knows a thing by identifying itself with the object.

Even in the state of wakefulness when the self is in association with all the instruments, the self does not know all at once. It knows one thing and begins to know some other thing. In the process it forgets a thing which has been well known already. Even in knowing things one after another, it has the knowing and forgetfulness alternately. If we carefully consider this centre of consciousness it is neither insentient, nor the perfect knowledge which knows all things at all times perfectly. This is the self, which identifies itself with the thing known.

The difference between the Supreme and the individual self is that the former is conscious of all things immutably without getting itself attached to the thing known whereas the latter knows things getting itself attached to it. This dependence on the thing known for its knowledge is explained at the end of the first section by the commentator.

It must be noted that the reasoning given in the aphorism itself argues from the point of view of the state of loneliness (Kevala) of the self : the paraphrase argues from the point of view of the state of liberation (purity) or (suddha) of the self. The illustrative verse

argues from the state of impulsions in wakefulness (*masakalam*) of the self. This topic has explained the fact that the self is not the supreme being either which transcend *maya* (*tatparamum allai*).

Seventh topic:

Thus when self is established to be different from these various things, the opponent says that it is correct that the self is different from these particular things as there is no consciousness even if a single factors of these is absent. But as there is consciousness when all the factors are present, it should be concluded that the self is the collection or aggregate of these various factors. This view is held by the Sautrantikas and the Vaibhashikas among the Buddhists. This is refuted in this topic.

In the foregoing first five topics the self is shown to be different from the particular things that were the objects of the self conscious self. In the sixth topic it is shown to be different from even the primal being as it becomes conscious only when it is induced to be conscious. Here in the seventh topic it is shown that it is different from the aggregate too of all the various things individually shown to be different from this the sequence of the topic can be understood.

The proposition is :

There is the self in the body composed of products of *maya*. The meaning is that as the constituent parts of the body are the products of *maya* they are short lived and the self which is everlasting is certainly different from the products of *maya*.

Here the Buddhists point out that their view is that that the self is the aggregate of *citta* and its five subdivisions, *rupa*, *vedana*, *kurippu*, *bhavana* and *vijnana* and that they are not in their opinion the products of *maya*. So in order to refute their contention the author gives a different ground.

The ground is :

Those constituent parts are known by different names.

Even when you call the constituent parts *citta* and its subdivisions, they have different names and they are not called by the name self. So it is not proper to suppose that the aggregate is the self.

The contention of the Buddhist schools may be that even though they are named differently, in their aggregate they are named the self. To refute this contention the following illustrative verse is given. III 7 (a) On examination, they are evolutes of maya, beginning with kala and ending with earth, and they are not lasting. If you first grasp the nature of knowledge that they yield and then inquire what their collections mean, you will find they are known as bodies, which manifest objects to the self even as lamp enables the eye to perceive its objects. So even as the lamp is different from the eye, these collections are different from the self, which is you.

Even when each constituent part is named, they are named as evolutes from kala to earth and not as indicated by the opponent. When they are considered as aggregates they are not called the self collectively as mentioned by the opponent, but they are called the gross body, the subtle body etc. which illumine the objects so that the self may perceive them.

This topic brings out the implication of the saying in III 1 a that the self is an entity different from either maya and its products or the primal being but it is a separate entity (Tani).

This is the end of the first chapter of Section one, the existence of the three entities.

CHAPTER II

NATURE OF THE CATEGORIES

Fourth aphorism :

Though the self is not one of the inner sensoria, being devoid of knowledge because of the innate impurity, it is associated with them like a king with his ministers, and has five states of consciousness : This is the aphorism.

Intention : If it be enquired into what it intends to convey, This also is that.

This chapter is on the nature of the categories. As per the methodology, the concept of a thing is obtained both by the knowledge of its existence and also by that of its nature. So in the first chapter the valid means of knowledge of existence of the three categories have been given and in the second chapter their respective natures, in the reverse order, are taken. Of the three aphorisms of this chapter, the fourth one gives the nature of the individual self, which has been conveyed by mention in the third aphorism.

Here it may be objected to by saying that the author, by giving the intention of this aphorism, has said that it is the same as the previous one. But to say that the third aphorism has given the means of existence and the fourth gives the nature of the self seems to be contradictory to the author's reference.

This objection is the effect of mere ignorance, for the reference made in the intention of an aphorism will relate to the intention alone, and not to the meaning of the aphorism.

The expression, 'This also is that' means that the intention of this aphorism is also to depict the luminosity of the self. Luminosity of the self referred to the existence of the self there (in the third aphorism), whereas it indicates its nature here (in the fourth aphorism), so as to accord with the meanings of the respective aphorisms. The author has chosen a general term to convey the intention to suit both the contexts, which resulted in the parsimony of words. It should be noted that the author had avoided the use of the particular term, the existence. Even though the chapters are different, yet the continuity of thought is maintained by this usage.

It may be noted that the five states of consciousness of the self are indicated in the third aphorism while establishing its existence and the same have been elaborated in the fourth. Hence even if the reference, 'This also is that' is taken to indicate the meanings of the aphorisms, there is no harm.*

Now, to express the nature of an entity after its mention (uttēca) is the conventional order : by this relationship we have the relevance of the topic. In the third aphorism the means of existence of the self was given : after that the following objection is raised. It is the self which is established should possess one uniform nature. But here the self is said to possess different natures. The self knows the objects of the senses, it is conscious of what happens when these senses cease to be active, it remains without experience and activity and it knows when caused to know. This objection of want of uniformity is removed in the fourth aphorism. This provides the relevance of the aphorism. To give the nature of a thing after expressing the means of knowledge of its existence is a case of fulfilling the natural desire. By this the relevance of the chapter is obtained. This way whatever is necessary here may be supplied from the commentary on the second aphorism.

The following is the paraphrase of the aphorism :

Though the self is not one of the internal faculties, mind, intellect, ego and citta, it is associated with them to have definite perception of the external world, even as a king is enabled to do his duty in con-

* The commentator says this to sharpen the intellect of the reader by indicating that an aphorism will be capable of several interpretations, but the faultless alone should be chosen by the intelligent reader.

junction with his ministers. So, it undergoes five different states of consciousness. A king is naturally ignorant of the ways of the world, so also the self is devoid of its consciousness because of its innate impurity called āṇava, the root mala. The consciousness regained by the self by its association with Kala etc. which are also known by the generic name internal instruments, but compared to the shirts of a person, is of a general nature and they cannot enable the self to have the definite perception of the things of the world. The five states are wakefulness, dream, sleep, sound sleep and suppression of activity or respiration. From this, the characteristic of the self that it undergoes different states of consciousness by remaining thus is obtained.

In the above construction, the expression, *Sandittatu* (associated with) has been treated as a participle. But it may also be treated as a finite verb and the aphorism may be construed as two definite ideas to suit the division of the topics as follows : Alternative phrase :

Though the self is not one of the inner sensoria, as it is devoid of consciousness because of its inherent impurity, it is associated with them ; after its association, it functions with them as the king with his ministers and undergoes the five states of consciousness.

The subordinating conjunction 'though' is expressed in the form *api* in the sanskrit version of the aphorism. So it is to be concluded that the author's intention is to express the idea that the self is not identical with the inner sensoria, as a conceded (admitted) one. By this concession the idea itself may be taken to have been conveyed here in this aphorism itself. Those that are ignorant of this fact will express the idea as a coordinate principal clause. In that case, there is no continuity of thought and it does not stand to reason that two independent ideas are expressed in a single aphorism.*

The term ātma (self) can be understood from the previous aphorism even if it were not expressed here. But this aphorism does express the term. This is to indicate two main ideas : they are (1) that this aphorism belongs to a different chapter ; and (2) that the term con-

* The convention that an aphorism should express a single idea. (oru poruṇ nūṭaliya sūttirattāṇum) should be noted here.

veys the meanings pervasiveness and cidacit (that which partakes of the nature of the contiguous object which it falls on and poses to be sentient or insentient according to the nature of the entity which it falls on). So the expression of the term may not be considered an excess.

This aphorism issues into the following three topics : (i) The self is not one of the inner sensoria ; (ii) being devoid of sentiency because of its innate impurity, āṇava mala, it is associated with them, and (iii) it has five states of consciousness like a king with his ministers.

First topic

The first topic establishes that the self is an entity different from the inner sensoria, refuting the school of thought that identifies it with them.

The relevance of the topic is as follows : In the last topic of the third aphorism, the reason used for establishing the self as something other than the effects of māyā is that none of them was known to be the self by its name and that even in the well-known groups they constitute they are known as gross body, subtle body etc. So it has been established that the self is an entity placed in the body which is constituted by the effects of māyā, which aids the self like a machine.

There objection may be raised in the following manner : it is true that all effects other than the inner sensorium are not named as the self. But it is seen that the inner sensoria in various contexts are referred to as the self itself. For example, the 28th stanza of the fourth Sūtra of Śivajñāna Siddhi says, 'Intellect is called mind and mind the intellect ; citta is called the self and the self citta ; the Prime being is called the individual self and the self the Prime-being'.

To ward off that they are so called by the figure of substitution cannot hold water, for there should be some relationship to call one thing as the other : if it be shown that they are so called because of a particular relationship, that relationship can also be attributed to the sense organs ; but they are never called the self. So to hold such internal sensorium to be the self there can be no valid objection. Thus there is a reasonable doubt in the case of the internal sensorium

while determining the self as different from them. To remove this doubt the first topic is taken.

But still, as the topic belongs to the existence of the self, the question arises why this topic was not taken in the third aphorism itself, which is its proper place. The answer is that even if the topic was taken in the third aphorism, it would have been necessary to say in the fourth aphorism that the self is associated with the inner sensorium even though it is not one of them. Such a repetition will be contradictory to the terseness of an aphorism which requires to be constructed with the minimum of words involving brilliant, elaborate and subtle interpretation. So the author has expressed the idea in the form of a concessional clause and conveyed the sense here itself. As the idea is not expressed as a coordinate principal clause, the locality of the idea is condoned.

Of the two schools of thought that the internal organs are collectively called the self and that they are individually called the self, here the latter school is taken, for the refutation of the former case was disposed of in the third aphorism itself while dealing with the last topic.

Proposition

The self is not one of the inner faculties mind, intellect, ego and citta.

The mention of the names mind and others is to separate them from kalā etc. which are also known as inner faculties. Of those that believe in the existence of the inner faculties kalā etc., there is none who mistakes them as the self. So there is no prima facie case to be refuted there. It is only the comparatively external ones, known as internal faculties mind etc., that are to be shown to be different from the self. Also, these evolutes alone are compared to the ministers, whereas kalā and others are compared to the shirts of the self. Hence the necessity for the mention of the names mind etc. of the internal sensoria will be appreciated. It is only the internal faculties mentioned here that are responsible for the different states of consciousness.

Those that do not know this will argue that to omit the mention

of kalā etc., will be too narrow and will attempt to include both the groups while interpreting the term antahkaraṇa (inner faculties).

Now it may be argued, let it be so ; but since you hold that ' the four mind, intellect, ego and citta will associate with the self and will function as the self itself '¹¹ why should not we hold that they are themselves the sentient self. In that case the following ground is given to remove the doubt and establish the proposition.

Ground

Because they do not remain luminous while yet appearing to be luminous.

Citta will examine an object of the senses ; but it will not know that it examines. Mind will classify the same object and will remain in doubt, but it will not be conscious of its action. Ego will determine a course of action, but it will not be conscious that it so determines. Intellect will decide as to the nature of an object, but it will not be conscious that it so decides. But in the case of the self it is not only conscious of the object, but is also self-conscious. It associates itself with these internal sensoria and examines, comprehends, determines and decides and then when the intellect modifies itself into the quality of the object of perception and assumes one of the forms of either pleasure, pain or indifference, is also conscious of its experience, that it experiences pleasure, pain or indifference.

Thus the self is luminous not only with respect to its object but also with respect to itself, but the inner faculties are luminous with respect to their objects only. So the self cannot be one of the internal faculties.

Here the terms luminous and not luminous mean conscious and not conscious. Sivajnana siddhi says, in stanza 11 of the 11th sutra, ' Both the self and the intellect are sentient, but can the intellect equal the self ? ' There the author conveys this difference in their natures : intellect is conscious of its object alone, whereas the self is conscious of not only the nature of the object but also of its own nature. Though the ministers are the servants of the king, since they are closely associated with the king, they are called the king

¹¹ Siddhi, 4th sutra, st. 2.

by courtesy usage. So also, the internal evolutes are closely related to the self than the external instruments and hence they are at times spoken of as the self itself. On that account it is not proper to confuse them as the self.

Since the inner sensoria are the aids to the self in its apprehension of objects, they are compared to the ministers. The other instruments are compared to other personages of the retinue. That will be shown on a future occasion.

In order to establish that the self is not one of the internal sensoria the author has chosen to give a ground different from the grounds that have been used to prove that it is not the physical body etc., for this is more important than others.

The following illustrative verse shows how the internal organs are luminous with respect to the external instruments, which are subordinate to them, but are not luminous both with respect to themselves and those that are superior to them.

(a) The object of mind and other inner faculties is the external sense-object and these faculties are different from their object. The object of the consciousness of the self is what appears in the intellect (buddhi) which is higher than mind. Just as mind etc., are different from the external objects, so also the self is different from the intellect, mind and other faculties. These two perceptions, mental and experiential, appear in the self one after the other like the waves that rise in sea as cause and effects, and reach the shore.

It is to be noted that the sense perception which is indeterminate is the first to take place : it is followed by mental perception, which is determinate in form. This mental perception is followed by the experiential perception. In the sense perception the object is the impression made on the senses, whereas in the mental perception the object is the source of the sense impression. In the case of the experiential perception, the object is the modification of the intellect which is within, but above the mind and the instruments which enlightens the self is vidya, (grouped with) kalā etc. These kalā and others are also known as inner instruments, but are compared to the shirts of the self (kalā etc., constitute the kanjuka Śarīra—body like the outer coat).

From the above it will be seen how the (gross) internal faculties, mind, intellect and others, are sentient with respect to the objects subordinate to them, but with regard to themselves and their superiors are insentient. The self is sentient with respect to all cases.

The following illustrative verse shows how even in mental perception the four faculties cause a series of responses similar to the waves of the sea and remain different from the self.

(b) Even in the mental perception, which relates to an object of sense perception, the self has different awareness according to its association with the different faculties. Being associated with citta, the self examines the object; as mind it receives the sense-impressions, as ego it questions the data and as intellect it decides what the object is. Because the self functions in these different ways, it is other than the inner faculties in whose association these different awarenesses take place. This is similar to the fact that the evolute time is other than its measuring agents, the sun, moon etc., in whose association it is differently named as day, night, month etc.*³

Saiva Siddhanta distinguishes between the world of things and the world of ideas (Porul ulaku governed by kāraka Śakti and Coll ulaku governed by Jñāpaka Śakti). So the commentary proceeds to say by way of introduction to the next illustrative verse as follows : These internal faculties become active as the self contacts them being provided with the five shirts (kala, etc.) and the five infirmities (indiscrimination, egoism, longing, desire and aversion). But the mental perception which is caused by the inner sensorium is discriminate in nature being qualified by name, species etc., such a discriminate awareness is only caused by the world of words (subtle, gross, impression and expression). So the author expresses the literal sounds

*³ There are two opinions with respect to the conception of the faculty of citta. Sivajnana munivar thinks that citta is a modification of the mind, which it assumes as soon as the sense-perception is caused. But there are others who view that citta is Mūlaprakṛti itself which retains the past impressions and proves to be the cause of past memory. According to them, as soon as the sense impression is caused, mind catches hold of the impression and the intellect decides what the object is. Ego supplies the necessary determination by activating respiration and circulation of blood and citta—retains the impressions caused by these activities. What passes on in citta will be brought before consciousness only when mind is active as in dream. Though citta is active in sleep, its activity cannot be known as mind is not active. (Refer to St. of Gñānamirtam).

that activate the sensoria so that they may cause different awareness constituting the mental perception.

(c) Alpha causes ego (Ahankar) to function ; U, intellect (Buddhi) ; M, mind (Manam). Bindu causes citta to function ; and Nāda, the self in the form of ullam or (Purusa). Taken together they form pranava (OM). Consequently the awareness in mental perception rise and fall like the waves of the sea.

Intention of the author is to mention the literal sounds that impel the inner sensoria ; similarity of the topic has induced him to speak of the sound that impels purusa as well.

Sivajnana siddhi has said in st. 24 of the first Sutra that the four literal sounds, as they lean on the five kalas Nivrtti onwards will appear as five. The correct interpretation after a study of the concerned paddhatis and deep thinking leads us to mean these five as particles that together make up pranava. Nāda is that causes the self to have mere awareness (subtle) ; bindu is that which causes indeterminate perception (gross) and A, U & M that impel the three internal faculties ego, intellect and mind. These three together cause impression. The same impression when expressed in the form of speech is called expression. So it is clear how the four speech forms are also expressed in five elements when they are attached to the five kalas, Nvrtti, Pratistha, Vidya, Santi, and Santyatita.*

It is to be understood that the same four kinds of speech sounds are split up into five letters when they happen to enliven the five faculties. These five letters when pronounced together form pranava (Om). The subtle five letters are respectively the cause of the letter uttered just above, and nada happens to be the primal cause. These subtle letters are the same as the gross five letters (Sivāyanama) and so the nature of being respectively cause and effect equally holds good even in their case. These five subtle letters when modified into ajapa (hamsam) they cause the respiration (ha causing expiration and sa causing inspiration). By this means (respiration) the alternation of the states of *conjunction* (association) and *loneliness* (Sakala and Kēvala) in the form of thinking and forgetfulness take place.

* Kindly note the difference in the explanation given by Sivajnana munivar in this respect.

The consequent rise and fall of thought is like the rise and fall of the waves in the sea. In verse (a) the similarity between rise and fall of the waves and the rise and fall of thought is with respect to the newness of the happening, whereas in verse (c) it is with respect to the cause and effect of the events. So they should not be considered to constitute the error of repetition. The same ajapa which is the modification of the five subtle letters form the prāsāda of 12 parts which has six voids in the course of modification. The transformations take place alternately with regard to the different presiding deities, at first the three transformations consisting of three particles each, and the three next transformations taking place each changing into one. So the total comes to twelve.*

Thus the five subtle letters constituting pranava, the five gross letters called usually the letters five, ajapa of the two forms, hamsa and soham, and prāsāda are to be known as non-different. Details may be found in the Sivāgamās.

Now it should be remembered as a fundamental principle that whatever is manifest in the effect should be implied in an unmanifest form in the cause. In the mental perception we have the discrimination of a thing with regard to its name, kind, quality, action, and thing. So even in the sense-perception we should have those distinctions implied in an unmanifest form. Hence it should be concluded that the five subtle letters are activating the five sense organs, and the subtle and gross five elements that strengthen them.*II

(d) In mental perception the five subtle letters constituting pranava are said to activate the faculties. Since these five letters are themselves inert, these letters are reported to be moved by the

* Ajapa takes the form of hamsa at first and transforms into the kalas a, u and m which is followed by a void. Then the ajapa takes the form Soham and modifies into the three prasadas chandra (full moon), ardha chandra (semi-circular moon) and Nirodi (in the form of a triangle) followed by a second void). Then Hamsa changes into nada (a straight line), nadanta (in the form of an obtuse angle the higher arm being less) and Sakti (reversed obtuse angle) followed by a void. Similarly ajapa modifies into trident followed by the fourth void, samana (two straight bright streaks bordered by two points), followed by the fifth void and unmana (a big circle followed by the sixth void).

*II The ear and the subtle and gross sky are each activated by Nada ; the sense of touch and air are activated by bindu ; the eye and fire are activated by m ; the tongue and water are activated by U, and the nose and earth are activated by a.

presiding deities. Sadāśiva moves nāda, Íśvara moves bindu, paraman, *m*, viṣṇu *u* and aja (or Brahma) *a*. Of these it is to be understood that visnu and Brahma mentioned here are those that reside in pure vidya along with Srirudra and they are not to be confused with those that reside in prakṛti.

Second Topic (IV) (ii)

In the first topic it was established, through the concessional clause, that the individual self which is both self-conscious and conscious of objects is an entity other than the internal faculties, which are aware of the objects only. The second topic answers the objection that may be raised in the form, ' why such a self becomes conscious only in conjunction with the inner sensoria, which are inert by themselves ? '

This relevance of the second topic may also be derived from the content of the third aphorism thus : The aphorism says that the self knows the five sense objects in its wakeful state ; that it knows confusedly what happens in the dream when the senses become inactive ; that it remains without experience and activity in sleep and sound sleep ; and that it knows only when it is lifted from oblivion and caused to know. Thus the self knows in its state of association (sakala), when it is caused to know. Even in its state of purity it knows only when caused to know. Thus it is clear that the individual self experiences different states of consciousness. Naturally the question arises why should the self experience these different states. The question is answered by the second topic.

Proposition

This self loses its consciousness because of its *innate impurity* (sahaja mala).

The force of *This* in the phrase, ' *This self* ', is that the self which is conscious of both itself and its objects.

The bonds of the self are of two kinds : one is the innate, associated with it from the very beginning ; the other group, *māyā* and *karma*, is an acquired one, being added to it by the Supreme in order to remove the innate impurity. These are called āgantuka malas (the

impurities that came later on). Thus the qualifying adjunct innate (sahaja) points the existence of impurities, *māyā* and *karma*, that came later on (āgantuka malas). It should be noted that though the effects of *māyā* and *karma* are added to the self later on yet they exist eternally even like *āṇava*.

From the proposition it is learnt that since *āṇava* prevents the consciousness of the self from eternity even as the verdigris prevents the shining of copper, the latter has to function in conjunction with the evolutes of *māyā* and experience thereby different states of consciousness. Thus to remove the objection, the innate impurity is reintroduced for the second time so as to reveal its nature, after its first introduction by its mere mention, in the first aphorism. (The student will remember the expression of the first aphorism'. 'The world come into existence from and because of the agent of dissolution on account of mala (odunki malattu uḷatām).

The nature of impurity is that it is with the self from eternity causing oblivion, and when it is associated with the evolutes of *māyā* in addition, it causes the five states of consciousness to it. Thus the special and the general characteristics of the innate impurity are both given here at once. The special nature of the root impurity *āṇava* is what is obtained of it, in the state of loneliness (*kēvala*), and its general nature is what is obtained of it in the state of association (*sakala avastha*) a₁

The following ground is given with a view to answer the objection that may be raised as follows : since the self is without consciousness because of its connection with the innate impurity to say that it has consciousness by the addition of the evolutes of *māyā* will be inconsistent with the theory of *satkārya vada*, (which establishes that the effect is implied in its cause, and so all effects are real or *sat*).

Ground

For the innate impurity obscures the consciousness of the self which is ever present.

¹ It should be noted that the special nature of other entities is defined as that obtained in the state of purity (the state of salvation) of the self.

The expression *obscures* is to express the meaning in Tamil of the Sanskrit phrase, *Jnana Tirodaka* (obscurer of consciousness) used by the author in order to adhere to the tradition. *Tirodaka* is a term used to indicate the subject of hiding. The Tamil expression used by the author is *maraittukodu nitrelan*. By this use the schools of thought that hold ignorance as mere absence of consciousness etc. are refuted.

The author of Sivaditya mani dipika, at the end of the first topic where the print or the result is expressed refutes those that hold *ignorance* as the absence of consciousness and establishes that the impurity is an eternal substance, having many potencies, and that in salvation as the potencies alone are destroyed and not the substance impurity there is no defect in holding it as eternal. The earnest student is requested to look there where such questions are taken up and dealt with in a catechismal way.

The following illustrative verse refutes the school of *Aikyavadins* who say that the physical body which is the effect of *maya* itself is the impurity and that to hold a different entity as impurity lands us in the defect called excess. The verse strengthens the ground by showing the great difference that lies between the effects of *maya* and those of impurity. (a) The self knows nothing unless it has the body, the product of *maya*, as a means of enlightenment. Impurity conceals the self from eternity like the fire wood which conceals the living fire within itself and is one with it.

This verse shows that *maya* acts like a lighter and reveals the worldly objects to the self whereas *impurity* functions like darkness and prevents the self's consciousness from objectifying anything. Hence the functions of *maya* and impurity are opposite and so *maya* or its effects cannot be the impurity which conceals things from the sight of the self.

The verse qualifies fire by two adjuncts, *atuatu ay* and *viyata*, which mean that the fire identifies itself with the thing which is in union with it and it does not cease to exist even though it is not seen. The identifying nature of fire should be seen in the fact that it does not show itself separately when it hides either in the fire wood or in the convex lens.

The predicate, 'is one with it' means that the fire wood is non-separable from fire, i.e., in other words, the fire wood is in advaita relation with fire. The in-destructability of fire is known from its appearance when churning or rubbing against the fire wood is performed.

The adjunct, the predicate and the relation which are attributed to the thing compared in the verse should be suitably transferred to the original, viz., the self. Thus the commentator makes us understand from the verse that the self identifies itself with the thing that it comes in contact with, that it does not cease to exist even when it is obscured by the innate impurity or the effects of maya and that it is in nonseparable relation with the things that it associates with.

The illustrative verse expresses that the impurity conceals the consciousness of the self from eternity (*malam anru anaital*) ; its purpose is to distinguish the impurity which is eternal, from *maya* and *karma* which start to function at a point of time (*mayai kanmankal pola adi anru*).

Innate Impurity

This impurity is conceived in various ways by different schools of thought. Some people will affirm that it is only the erroneous knowledge of things and not any other thing. Some will say that it is the mere absence of consciousness. Yet some others will say that it is the quality of inertia (the strand of *tamas* of the three *gunas*). Some will assert that it is only the ignorance that has its origin in the root *prakṛti*. Others will say that it is only the *maya* and *karma*. Some others will say that it is only the potency of *Siva* and yet others will conceive it as a quality of the individual self.

But it is different from all these and is one, eternal, pervasive substance, which obscures the consciousness of the individual selves. We shall briefly show how it is so.

From the grounds expounded in the third aphorism, that there is no such thing as the self etc. ; we obtain the existence of a self which is other than the void etc. From the perceptual experience that this is a pot etc ; we also obtain that it is a conscious entity, everlasting, without beginning or end, and pervasive. So its awareness

or consciousness also should be everlasting and pervasive. Knowing is objectifying awareness and is none other than that, we see that such an awareness is limited by time and space, as it persists at times and is absent at other times. As awareness manifests itself artificially, there should be a cause for making it appear so. This cause is the impurity, which is other than the erroneous knowledge of things etc. Thus the existence of the root impurity is established by the proof by elimination.

Here a question may arise as follows. It is true that the existence of the individual self is established by the grounds stated in the third aphorism. But to say that the experience of awareness of the existence of a pot arises in that self itself bristles with difficulties, for the Sankyas hold that it arises in the evolute intellect (buddhi tattva) in the presence of the self. The answer is that the intellect is inert and it can show a thing like a mirror to the self which is conscious like a lamp, but it cannot know or experience a thing. It may be argued that though the intellect is inert, as the self falls on it as image, it can have the power to objectify. Well said, Even in reflection it is only the eye that can see the object and not the mirror. So also it is only the self that can experience an object, even in the case where the intellect reflects the object in the presence of the self. It is only the self that is both self-conscious and conscious of the object.

Also the transference of the power of consciousness of the self to the intellect should be made either by combination (Sankranta) or by reflection (addhyasa). If it be a case like the transference of fragrance of flower to water, then as the flower loses its smell as soon as the fragrance combines with water, the self should lose its power of consciousness as soon as it is appropriated by the intellect, which is not the case. Hence the transference by combination should be attributed only to insentient things and not to the sentient entities like the selves. The transference by reflection (Addhyasa vada) is belittled by all schools of thought and not accepted by greatmen to be worthy of following.

Let it be so. The definition of consciousness as that which knows or objectifies appears to be too narrow in the presence of the Buddhist's assertion that there is what is called alaya vijñana which has no object. If one asks to explain the nature of such alaya vijñana,

there is no worthy answer forth coming. So to conceive it as an entity is like conceiving the lotus of the sky as an entity.

From the above arguments it becomes acceptable that the self has consciousness. But to say such a consciousness is everlasting without beginning or end and that it is pervasive requires a valid proof. So the opponent may be inclined to say. If that be the difficulty we shall answer as follows :

If the individual self is supposed to have beginning and an end, then we shall have to suppose also that the karma (action) that is performed by that individual is destroyed without being fructified and the self eats up the fruits of karma which is not performed by it. This is in contradiction to what all was said with regard to the theory of karma. So we have the eternity of the self established. Also it is a fact of perception that a newly born child puts forth efforts to suckle its mothers' milk instinctively, knowing that it is the means of satisfying hunger. This can happen only as a result of the impression of habits in a previous birth. This also points to the eternality of the self. An eternal thing cannot be limited in space. So it is also pervasive. As the quality of a thing should be co-extensive with it, it follows that consciousness which is the quality of the self should also be eternal and pervasive as the self itself.

Arhats or Jains will hold that the self is of the shape and size of the body which it occupies, since consciousness is limited to the body itself. They hold that it can assume the size of the body. The self of an ant is tiny and the self of an elephant is of a big size, and the self has the power of contraction or expansion like leech so as to become of the shape and size of the body which it assumes. If this be true we shall have the power of consciousness of a self in proportion to the size of the physical body that it assumes. But that is not the case. We see evidence of more knowledge in a self of the small body and of less knowledge in a self of the big body. Knowledge is not limited to the physical nature of the body. A man can conceive of a thing and think about it even if it be at a great distance like the polar star. If the self contracts and expands, it will show that it is composed of parts and is destructible. Thus the inconsistency of the school of thought can be easily seen.

Pancaratrins and others hold the view that the individual self is atomic in size for the following reasons : the self leaves the physical

body and undergoes the process of going and coming back ; even when it is confined to the physical body, it experiences the five states of consciousness ; in Sivagamas there is the usage of referring to the selves as atoms ; it is held that the self exists in the lotus heart as a drop of mist on the tip of a grass-blade ; vedas also declare so. Hence it is proper to hold that the selves are atomic in size. But it is to be explained how the self is felt to exist in all parts of the physical body instead of being confined to a particular part, and how it is possible to see a distant object like the polar Star. But they will explain by saying that though the self is atomic in size its quality, consciousness, is pervasive, even like the light of a lamp is not confined to the size of the lamp, but pervades on all the sides.

But this cannot hold water for the following reasons : the quality of a thing is always co-extensive with the qualified. The light of a lamp is only the subtle form of the lamp and it is only a substance and no other thing. So it cannot be cited as an example where the quality is pervasive whereas the qualified is a limited thing. We have also stated while dealing with the sense organ of eye that the coolness, heat and smell of particular things are only brought by the blowing of the wind along with the respective qualified substances. The expression that the quality will pervade in the space where the qualified substance is not present is only the outcome of ignorance of the person who does not know the relationship between substance and its qualities. During the state of bondage since the self assumes the form of the subtle body it is called in the Vedas and the Agamas atom. Atom means the subtle body. Since it is so it is possible for the self to undergo death and birth and to be like a drop of mist on the tip of a grass blade in the heart—lotus. In stanza., II.3. a ; this truth has been expressed by the author in the expression, ‘ the soul passes as subtle body and falls into the womb, desire propelling ’, and so there can be no objection to hold the self to be pervasive simply because it undergoes death and birth. The verbal testimony, Vedas and Agamas hold the self as all-pervasive ; even the expression Atma means only the all pervasive, eternal consciousness. For all these reasons it is not proper to hold the self as atomic and it is to be remembered that it can pervade to a distant place and know things there.

If it be so, for the above reasons the self can be conceived to be eternal and pervasive without having a beginning and end. What

is the means of knowledge to hold that even its intelligence which is only its quality is eternal and all-pervasive likewise? Naiyayikas and others hold that the substance will last while its quality may undergo changes like beginning and end. It is our perceptual experience, that the ether lasts while its quality the sound possesses beginning and end, and is limited. Similarly they say that the self is ever lasting and all-pervasive while its quality the knowledge is limited and undergoes beginning and end. It is not so. When the quality is destroyed the qualified substance also is destroyed and we have no instance to show that the qualified substance does not cease to exist when the quality is being destroyed. In the case of the sound, the quality of ether, the truth is as follows. The pot is not perceived in darkness and when light is brought in, the form of the pot becomes visible. On this account it is not held that the pot is destroyed in darkness and is being recreated in the light. Similarly the sound which is the quality of ether is perceived only when there are the manifesting factors and it remains unperceived when those efforts are absent. On this account it is not proper to hold that the sound was destroyed and again recreated. Simply because the sound is not perceived in the absence of manifesting factors, it is not proper to hold that the qualified substance continues to exist whereas its quality is being destroyed and recreated. In the case of hot water becoming cool, the coolness of water is prevented by the combination of fire and when the combination is removed, the coolness reappears without any efforts contributing towards coolness. So it is not proper to hold that the coolness is being destroyed and is once again created. The same thing holds good in all similar cases. In satkaryavada even things subject to destruction such as the body and senses are shown to be indestructible and it need not be repeated here. So it may be clearly understood that the quality of the intelligence of the self which is ever lasting and pervasive is also everlasting and pervasive. But its manifestation and unmanifestation are due to artificial means and its unmanifestation is due to a particular cause, which is called root impurity.

Here a question may be raised as follows :—

Although the intelligence of the self may be as above, it may be taken to be like the quality of sound that manifests itself when there are causal efforts and does not manifest its existence in their

absence and may be considered to be natural to the self. This alternative is the outcome of ignorance ; for, the causal things in the case of sound such as the short stick etc. are limited in space and time and so the manifesting quality sound does not manifest itself through the whole of the qualified substance but makes its presence felt only limited by the time and space. But the lighter of the intelligence of the self, the potency of Siva, is not limited by the factors of time and space, and on the other hand is eternal and all pervasive. So the manifesting factor here cannot be attributed with appearance at certain times and disappearance at other times. So the self's intelligence which is manifested by the potency of Siva cannot naturally be limited and the limitation is artificially caused by the pertinent factor. It is because of this the self's intelligence does not manifest itself uniformly like the quality of sound but is experienced increasing progressively from time to time.

If it be so, the cause for the artificiality may be taken to be one like erroneous perception (bhrandi knowledge) ; there is no valid means to consider it a thing other than those that are generally held by the other schools of thought. If that be the difficulty, we shall explain :

Erroneous perception like seeing a rope as a snake does not occur unless there is some defect in the eye. So also, the erroneous intelligence on the part of the self, where it conceives the gross-body etc. as the self, cannot occur unless there is some defect on the part of the self, that defect, which we call the innate or root impurity, exists other than the erroneous intelligence.

Now that defect may be taken to be the non-existence of intelligence. But on close observation non-existence can be classified into four kinds. They are eternal non-existence, posterior non-existence, natural non-existence and the prior non-existence. Of these the first three kinds are never destroyed. So to suppose the defect to be one of the first three kinds will imply that there is no release at all for the selves. But release is known to exist by its mention by the Vedagamas. So the defect must be considered to be the prior non-existence of intelligence. So the prior non-existence of everlasting intelligence should have a cause and that cause is the innate impurity.

Now if the quality of inertia etc., which are the effects of other things may be considered to be the innate impurity, the effect cannot be the innate impurity which hides the intelligence of the self, for the effect hiding the intelligence should have a cause and that cause is not determined. If we take those things to hide the intelligence even without a cause, then we should accept that the intelligence of the self will be prevented even after attaining release. So the innate impurity should be other than the quality of inertia etc., which are the effects.

The innate impurity cannot be considered to be a potency of Siva, for Siva's potency will always be intelligent. It cannot be non-sentient. The intelligence of the self should be hidden by a non-sentient substance and not Siva's potency which is always sentient. So the non-sentient innate impurity should also be something other than Siva's potency.

Since the root impurity is innate to the individual self there will be a tendency to consider it as a quality of the self. If it be a quality it cannot leave the self and it is established that the quality of the self is only intelligence. So the same substance will not possess two opposite qualities which are intelligence and non-intelligence. So it will be learnt that the innate impurity should be a substance other than the self.

Maya and karma are different from the self and are also non-sentient. Since they are supposed to restrain the potency of the self they may be supposed to be the innate impurity, but the authors of Saiva Siddhanta, Meykandar, Arulnandi and Umapati have clearly stated in their works that the functions of maya and karma are different from the function of the innate impurity. *Maya* and *karma* act like light which dispels darkness whereas the innate impurity acts like darkness which prevents the intelligence of the self. So the innate impurity is a substance other than maya and karma.

From these arguments it will be seen that the innate impurity is different from erroneous knowledge etc. It hides the intelligence of the self and is a substance, having ignorance as its quality. It is the innate impurity of the self even like the verdigris is innate to the brightness of the copper. It is a restraining force of the self which has no origin. If such a substance is considered to be many,

whatever is non-intelligent and many cannot be supposed to have no origin. Hence the innate impurity is considered to be one thing having many potencies. These potencies are many and are responsible for the division of the selves as vijñānakalas, pralaya-kalas and sakalas and are distinct to each self, being removable at different times. This innate impurity is the cause for the different causal states of the self as *kevala*, *sakala* and *suddha* (lonely, conjunctive and pure). It is eternal and pervasive and is named *anava*, since it pervades innately the selves which are called atoms. It is also known in Sanskrit words by the generic names *pasutva*, *pasunikara*, *mṛtyu murchha*, *mala*, *anjana*, *avidya avrtti* etc. Its power of hiding is limited to the individual selves and not extended to the universal self also. This is like the darkness which has the power to affect the seeing power of the eye, but it has no power to hide sun's light. But the presence of the universal self is not limited and so all the individual selves are always in the presence of the universal self. Hence there may be a reasonable doubt that the innate impurity which has no power to hide the intelligence of the universal self should have equally no power to hide the intelligence of the individual self. This is cleared by citing the following example. The darkness of the world cannot hide the healthy eyes in the presence of sun's light, but it can hide the eye-sight of persons who have their eyes affected by the defect of cataract even in the presence of sun's light. Similarly the individual selves which are affected by the innate impurity cannot see things all of a sudden even if the supreme Being attempts to make them perceive things all of a sudden. The supreme Being has to evolve the power of seeing of the individual self only by stages, even as the lotus reaches flowery stage by sun's light only by stages.

It is generally held that the Vijñānakalas are affected by the innate impurity alone. The pralaya-kalas are affected by the innate impurity and karma and the sakalas are those that are affected by the innate impurity, karma and maya. This is understood from Sivagamas. But it is said that the innate impurity alone is the root cause for such a division among the individual selves. Naturally one should desire to know the implication of this difference in the expressions. This implication will be explained in the later division of the work. Here it is enough to know that the innate impurity is the basis for all the difficulties of the individual self.

It should be understood that the Vijñanakalas have their experiences in the worlds that are in between impure maya and pure vidya. The pralayakalas will have their experiences in the worlds that are confined to the impure maya and raga and the sakalas will have their experiences in the worlds that remain between the root prakṛti and the earth.

Some Āgamas state that the Vijñanakalas and pralayakalas have their experiences in the worlds and tattvas of pure maya. The intention of the Āgamas is to mean the āparamuktas that have attained release among the Vijñanakalas and pralayakalas. They are *anusadasivas*, the Eight Vidyasvaras and the mantresvaras. The mantresvaras are located in the worlds belonging to pure vidya. The Eight Vidyasvaras of whom the head is known as Anantesvara are located in the worlds belonging to the *Isvara tattva*. The Anu Sadasivas are located in the world belonging to the tattva *sadakhya*. It should also be known that it is the considered opinion of the Siva-*gamas* that there are 31 tattvas even in pure maya just below suddha vidya. They are *pure time to pure earth* and they are similar to the impure time and impure earth which are the effects of the impure maya.

The name 'Vijñanakala' will imply those that have got rid of kala by *viñjana* and pralayakala may imply the persons who have got rid of kala during the time of aeon. But there are natural vijñanakalas who are affected by the innate impurity only, and pralayakalas who are affected by the innate impurity and karma. Those who become vijñanakalas artificially might have got rid of maya and karma by spiritual experience or *viñjana* or yoga or renunciation or initiation. Similarly those who get rid of maya owing to their special aptitudes may become pralayakalas in the middle. Those who become vijñanakalas and pralayakalas in the middle are called as such, as they are similar to the natural vijñanakalas and pralayakalas in being affected by one or two impurities respectively.

The five kalas *nivṛti*, *pratista* etc., are known to be such because of their generic names. But the *bhuvanas* in the tattva called *sakti* are also called by the same name without the consideration of the cause implied in the name. Also the name *pratyakṣa* when considered as a generic name will only indicate the indeterminate perception which is caused by the sense organs alone. But the same name is

used to indicate the mental perception and the experiential perception. Similarly the name vijnanakalas and pralayakalas may be used as generic as well as on similarity. These two names may apply to the persons not because of the similarity but because of privilege. Vijnanakalas have the privilege of being intuited by the Lord from within and the pralayakalas have the privilege of being given spiritual knowledge at the end of acon by the Lord himself in the second person. The word *kala* which forms part of the endings of two names *akalas* means only the bondage. The word 'vijñānākala' may be used in Tamil as vijnanakala.

In stanza 2 of the eighth sutra of Sivajnana Siddhi, it is said *commonly* that the selves are of three kinds ; in the eighth stanza of the introductory chapter of Sivaprakasam we have the following expression: ' The class of selves are of three kinds. They are naturally those that are affected by mala, those who are affected by karma and mala, and those that are affected by all the three bondage from the beginningless time.' The latter expression specially mentions that the three kinds persist from beginningless time. So it will be understood that this is the conception entertained by traditional scholars.

In Pauskara and other Agamas the pralayakalas and the Vijnana kalas who become so in the middle are cited as examples for those who are so from the beginningless time. So the expression need not confuse one. Even though the Vijnanakalas and pralayakalas have got kalas which enable them to have their respective worldly experience if they are free from bondage due to them. So they should be considered as akalas, not as sakalas.

Third Topic of Aphorism IV.

Proposition with the ground

Now, this self is stated to have five states of consciousness, the waking, dreaming, sleeping, the fourth, and beyond the fourth, for, when it is obscured by the nature of the impurity it has the nature of the tattvas which it contacts and identifies.

The commentary

In the foregoing topic, it was replied that since the self was obscured by impurity, it had to seek the aid of the inner sensoria, even

as the eye which has lost its power of sight by darkness has to seek light which is the manifesting aid ; and that thereby it had to experience different states of consciousness also, by knowing the five senses, by knowing what happens in the dreaming state, by remaining without experience and activity, and by knowing when caused to know. It is proper to say that because of the impurity, the self requires the manifesting aid of the sensoria : the eye which is aided by light perceives its objects, but it does not undergo different states of perception. Similarly, the self whose power of consciousness is obscured by impurity, when aided by organs should uniformly know the objects ; but to say that it undergoes different states of consciousness does not seem to be proper. The purpose of this topic is the removal of this objection.

The manifesting aid in the case of the eye is only one, the light ; but in the case of the self the aids are four different organs. So here the more appropriate example is not the eye and the light, which is a partial one, but it is the king who performs his duties with the help of the different ministers. Since this example has been used in the aphorism itself, the experience of different states of consciousness of the self is justified. Though Meykandar has compared the inner sensoria to the ministers because of their importance, it may be held to be his idea to compare other organs to the other political limbs of the king. Thus we can see such comparisons from Jnana-mrtam, verse 16. The translation of the stanza is as follows :

The individual self is like a prince who inhabits a mansion which has four floors. It is lifted up by the pillars of legs. It has two hands. The roof is constructed on the back-bone as the main beam. The rib bones are the rafters ; the walls are made up of flesh covered with the hairy skin. The head takes the place of a dome and the tuft of hair is the flag hoisted on the dome. The top-most floor is the middle of the forehead between the eyebrows. In the waking state the prince is here going round the state with his essential retinue.

He has the dream state when he descends to the third floor which is situated in the region of the neck. The prince has the state of sleep when he further descends to the second floor in the region of the heart. The self experiences the fourth state, Turiya (sound sleep), when it descends to the first floor, the region of the navel.

Thirty five members attend on the prince when he experiences the waking state. They are the five senses, the five motor organs, the ten objects of the senses and organs, the four inner sensoria or the mental faculties, and the ten variations of the respiratory system. The ears are compared to the foreign watchmen, the tactile sense constituting the system of spies, the eyes are the ambassadors, the tongue which tastes of the eatables are compared to the traditional singers of praise and the nose constitutes the priesthood. Of the five motor organs, the organ of speech are horsemen, the legs are the warriors who fight mounting on elephants, hands are the charioteers and excretory organs are the army.

The objects of the senses are the inner and outer attendants. The variations of the respiratory system are the inner members of the committee that assist the decision-making of the prince. They are the friends, educationists, the staff of the army, the medical men and the astrologers. Of the four ministers citta or the faculty of memory is the chief. Associated with these, the prince purusa, disposes the various state problems that are placed before him.* This is with regard to the waking state.

When the self descends to the dreaming state, the senses and the motor organs become actionless and the remaining twenty five organs function as well as they can, and the self experiences in a subtle manner similar experiences that were enjoyed in the waking state. This experience may be recalled in the waking state as there is the presence of the mind.

In sleep, the self is attended by citta, the chief of the ministry, and the life breath, the chief of the body guard, while all the other organs are left behind. Though the self has indeterminate awareness of the pleasure of the rest, since the other three especially the mind is not active, this cannot be reproduced in expression of the waking. The self loses even this indeterminate awareness by leaving cittam behind and entering the fourth state, where the activity continues owing to the presence of the vital air. In the state beyond the fourth (turiyatita), even the vital air is suspended, and there is no awareness

* cf.

niyati

Cindittu ayndu tunindu "ceyar padum antakkarana amaiccarum"
Jna — 16 : 28 — 30.

or action on the part of the self. This state is called *uyirppadakkam* in Tamil. The locus in the physical body for this state is the basis of the back-bone, which is known as *muladara*.

Since the author has chosen to deal with the states of consciousness, he has given similarities only for the states of consciousness. But the student may be desirous of knowing the familiar examples that are used with respect to the other evolutes.

They are as follows :

The evolutes *kala* etc., are compared to five shirts. Hence they may be compared to the armour that protects the body of the king. The subtle elements and the elements may be compared to the vehicle and the man on it, since they are said to strengthen the sense organs as the chariot is to the charioteer.

In the waking state the mention of sound etc., will indicate only the sense objects and not the subtle elements, which are called *tanmatras*. This is clear because they are classed along with the objects of the motor organs, speech etc., and are called the attendants of objects (*Vidaya-p-pal parijanamum*) as a whole. Those that are ignorant of this fact will confuse them with the subtle-elements called *tan matras*. If the *tan matras* which add strength to the sense organs are present there, there is no cause for the softening in the objectification as against the former state. Also, the Agamas state that the elements and their cause *tanmatras* are like pots and their over refinements etc. ; it is inconceivable to have one in the absence of the other ; and that when the elements are removed, the removal of the *tanmatras* also follows by implication. It is because of this, Umapati, the author of *Sivaprakasam*, the tertiary, while describing the causal state of association mentioned only the gross-elements by the expression, 'Ma budam aindil onrum' which implies the *tan matra* also.

There are various kinds of states of consciousness. Here the author means by five states only the five states waking etc, that happen in the state of loneliness. The ground given by the author is to remove the objection that may be raised by saying that the king is confined to a certain space and time where as the self, for which the king is cited only as partial example, is pervasive and eternal. So

the objection may be raised that such a self will not experience different states of consciousness. This objection is removed by saying that though the self is pervasive, yet it identifies itself with the different evolutes which aids it in the state of impurity. Here the word 'arupam' means only the evolute or tattva.

The meaning of the ground is expressed by the third stanza of the work of Ulagudai Nayanar.* The expression is, 'The locus of the self is the place where its intelligence is manifested'. Hence there is no question of saying that since the self is pervasive, we cannot say that the evolute can adhere to it and will separate from it and the self cannot have different states of consciousness.

The force of *this* in the expression *this self* of the proposition is that the self that has lost its consciousness on account of its connection with the *innate impurity*.

The expression *arupam* is used to indicate *tattvas*, because the evolutes *kala* etc, are called the subtler bodies (*paradeha*); *para*—means more subtle. The identification of the self with the evolutes lasts only upto the time that it obtains the pure state. So the condition, when it is obscured by the nature of impurity, expressed in the ground should be considered as a mere recollection of what was said in the previous topic, and the identification of the self with the evolutes alone should be considered as the ground proper.

The following illustrative verse purports to show how it forms the ground, by giving the functions of the evolutes and showing how the self experiences different states of consciousness.

(a) In the forehead the self identifies with the twenty-five which are combined with the five counted from speech and the five counted from the tactile sense. In the neck the identifying evolutes are the twentyfive without the combination. At the heart *citta* too combines; at the navel the vital air is added. At the basis, where no evolute combines, there is one.

From the illustrative verse IV, 3 a, it follows that there are thirty-five, twenty-five, three, two and one instrument in the respective loci forehead etc.

* Ulakudai Nayanar is a vaishnavite disciple of the second in the line of Namaccivaya desikar of Thiru Vavadturturai Adhinam, viz. The first Ambalavana desikar.

Twenty-five instruments combined with the five of speech etc ; and the five of tactile sense etc, are as follows : The ten objects of those organs, the inner sensoria which are four in number, purusa which experiences the states by associating with them, the variations ten of respiratory system the vital air etc, which add strength to the purusa to experience the different states being impelled by ego.

The five states

We shall show how the self experiences the five states in the different loci in combination with the organs :

The waking state

Generally the self is supposed to experience the state of consciousness which is called *preraka* Avattai (state in which the self is impelled to have worldly experience). Here the self is like a king who does his function with all his retinue. This state is described in Siva-prakasam by a stanza beginning the words '*Maruvia poriyil onrum*'. The meaning of the stanza is the self is active with one of the senses, one of the five elements, the four inner sensoria and the five inner evolutes that are always associated with the self, kala etc. In that state the main strength for clarity is given by the gross and subtle elements. The two elements and their modifications lose their potency and suspend their work so as to accord with the fruits of the work of the self. In this state even though the senses and other things are active, yet since the gross elements etc, have suspended their work the self has the experience in a softened manner (though it sees it fails to see fully, though it hears it fails to hear fully etc.). This state is the first state called waking one in the downward group or the lonely one. The locus for this is the middle of the forehead. Some people take the expression *Nudal*, to mean the eyes by substitution.

Here since there is knowledge and action with respect to the objects even though they are in a softened manner, we have the activities of the five senses, the five motor organs, the ten objects of these organs, the ten variations of the vital air and the four inner sensoria, mind, intellect, ego and citta and the agent, purusha. These are thirty-five in number. Here *tan matras*, the gross elements and other modifications suspend their work. Since the presence of the agent

is mentioned, it is implied that the activities of the root prakṛti, those of the five enumerated from kala, and those of the pure evolutes which impel kala etc., are present. It is not to be wrongly supposed that their activities are not present in the case of the states of consciousness that take place in the downward order.

Here it is only the instruments that function and cease to function in order to make the self have the various states of experience are mentioned. The mere mention of puruṣa will imply the presence of the root prakṛti, kala etc., and the pure evolutes. It should be known that the instruments which are supposed to be present by implication will never cease to function.

In one of the fourteen canonical works *porripahrodai* the description of the same five states in the ascending order has been given from line 53 onwards. There it is described that in the ground floor which is muladhara the self will lose itself but is present. To such a self Time and Destiny are shown and in the first floor which is the navel, the vital air is enjoined. There the self experiences the three aspects of potency conation, cognition and volition which are manifested by kala, vidya and raga and experiences the three qualities sattva, rajasa and tamasa. It may be doubted that since in the ascending order kala, time etc., are said to be present in the descending order they are absent. It is not so. From the expression that in the ground floor that is muladhara, the self loses itself is an indirect evidence to show that kala etc., are active there. To show the time and destiny will mean that since in the ground floor the other instruments are not present the activities of those two instruments are present there in a subtle form. When the other instruments are present, time and destiny will combine with them and will act in a gross form there. For the self to lose itself in the ground floor is to be present in the inner apartment along with his consort, the root prakṛti, and enjoy avidya alone among the five infirmities. This is clear from the reminiscence of a waking person that he had slept peacefully. It is only the immersion of the self in *tamasa* and is inactive. It should be remembered that unless the self is clothed in the five shirts which are kala etc., it cannot be called puruṣa ; i.e. it cannot objectify avidya and it cannot remain limited in time and space in that state. So the activities of kala etc., will take place in subtle form so as to objectify avidya and in consonance with it

Siva among the pure tattvas will be more active whereas the other four evolutes also are active in a subtle unmanifest form.

Stanza 70 of Satamanikkovai beginning with the words ‘Nilavu sakalattu ninra bhudadi’ (Elements etc.) which remained in sakala state means as follows. In sakala jagra the gross elements and tanmatras were present. They were absent when the self begins to experience the five states in the descending order. Here the expression bhuda adi (elements etc.) will mean the gross elements and the tanmatras which are their material cause. So the remaining 26 tattvas are present when the self begins to experience *kevala jagra* (the waking state in loneliness).

Of these the most important are the ten evolutes kala etc, and Siva etc., These are not counted while enumerating the instruments in the states of consciousness. Instead all the works take the ten objects speech etc., and the ten variations of the vital air for counting. These twenty are only the modifications of the evolute. Will you kindly explain why this is so? The student is directed to give careful consideration to the expressions of the authoritative works which may apparently be contradictory and give correct interpretations on similar lines.

From the above discussion the evolutes gross elements and subtle elements and all their modifications except the variations of the vital air and the objects of senses are the only instruments which fail to function in the downward wakeful state etc., and all the other instruments including the sense and mo or organs are active. It should also be understood that in the descending or in the ascending order, the five states are not different with respect to the loci, the number of instruments that are active and the experience of the self. It is because of this the authoritative texts describe the five states only in one order and leave the other order to be understood by the student.

Dream State

Of the thirty-five instruments the sense organs and the motor organs lose their potency in the dream state. The subtle objects which are within are the only things experienced by the self. The locus for this state is the neck.

As there is dreaming here, the existence of the subtle objects which are ten in number speech etc., the ten variations of the vital air that supply the incentive to the knowledge and action with regard to the objects, the four inner sensoria which objectify the subtle things, and the agent puruṣa are derived by presumption. These are twenty five in number.

There are persons who wrongly think that there is no dream in the descending state or in the ascending state. In Jnanamrtam st. 16, line 40, it is said in the descending state that there is dream in the words, 'the dream experience is described as in the waking state'. Porripahrodai while describing the states in ascending order speaks of the dream in the words (1.63) the self experiences in dream pleasure and pain in accordance with the two works even as they are experienced in the waking state'. We have also shown that as the activities of the evolutes are the same in both the cases it should be clearly understood that in both the directions there is dream experience at the locus neck.

While dealing with the classification of evolutes in Aphorism II (2) we have shown that even dream experience is as true as experiences in wakeful state. So the opinion of the Mayavadin who holds that dream is virtual and the experiences in the waking state which are compared to a dream is likewise virtual is to be held as improper and inconsistent.

Sleep

Now even the inner sensoria lose their potency and remain actionless. Consequently the ten objects speech etc., and sound etc., and the nine variations of the vital air except the vital air become also actionless. Then citta, the vital air which is impelled by ego for the purpose of guarding the gross organism and the puruṣa which conjoins with the above two are only active. Since in the state of sleep there is no activity of the intellect and the mind, the memory which citta has in that state cannot be recreated in the wakeful state. The locus for this experience is the heart.

The ego is active only in so far as moving the vital air. Since

it is not active in determining an object it is considered to be one of the instruments which is inactive.*

Turiya, the fourth state

Now even citta becomes inactive and the vital air which is being impelled by ego and the purusa are the only two instruments which are active. These objectify the safety of the body. This is the fourth state and the locus for it is the navel. *Turiyatita, the state beyond the fourth.*

Hereafter even the vital air becomes inactive. Purusa alone who is clothed with the five shirts namely kala etc., combines with the inseparable root prakrti and objectifies ignorance alone (avidya) of the five infirmities. The locus of this experience is the basis of the backbone which is called muladhara.

In this way the five states of consciousness of the self experienced in the descending order after it has left the directive state are described. In the next illustrative verse the ascending order is indicated by the author by way of repetition. So it will be understood that the self combines with the same instruments in the respective places and have the same experience in the ascending order. This can be understood from the description that is given in *Porripahrodai* also. There the work says that the self is imprisoned by means of heavy impurity. It means in the state beyond the fourth where there is no other instruments active the self is imprisoned by the ties of manliness which is the effect of the root prakrti.

Since this is mentioned in the context of dealing with the five states which are being experienced daily, this is the only possible meaning.

Illustrative verse 2

The self which has reached the waking state in the forehead experiences even there the five states. In that position it perceives by the several organs their respective objects, and then immediately withdraws from them. That is similarly five fold.

* The activity of citta can be perceived from the fact that problems which appear to be irresolvable before sleep will get themselves solved when one gets powerful sleep as soon as he wakes up. This may be called unconscious learning.

The qualifying clause of the subject of the first sentence expresses the same five states in the ascending order by mere repetition. The new idea conveyed by the first sentence is with regard to the directive state and the last sentence speaks of the pure state. Generally, the states of consciousness of the self are classified into two kinds, the causal and the effective. The environment of the self is either the innate impurity or the evolutes of maya or the divine grace. The states which are dealt with as affected by the innate impurity is called the lonely state or the kevala state.

The state as experienced by the self in association with the evolutes of maya is called the state in association or the sakala state. The state which is experienced by the self in the state of release is called the pure state or the suddha state. In each of these three causal states there are five effective states according to Saiva Siddhanta. The five states described in the first illustrative verse is the five effective states with regard to causal state, kevala. The other two kinds of effective states are indicated in the second illustrative verse. Since the aphorism does not deal with either sakala or suddha state in detail the respective effective states are merely indicated, so that the scholar may know that the five states described are not the only states that are experienced by the self. Sakala state or state in association is taken up in the fifth aphorism, whereas the state of purity or the suddha state is described in the sixth aphorism. The five effective states of the causal pure state will be clear in the next section (unmai or special section).

The following additional information is given by the commentator by a close study of the explanation given of this illustrative verse in the secondary, Sivajnana siddhi.

Of the two orders of the effective states in loneliness, the descending order enables the self to accrue its works, for there is no experience ; the ascending order exhausts the works of the self by subjecting it to the various experiences.

The five states in the locus of forehead can be understood in a gross manner by the self's objectifying a thing and immediately leaving it. But this can be understood by the shrewd observer of the activities of the organs. As a guidance, it is said that in the waking

state the five, in the dream state the four except suddha vidya, in the state of sleep the three pure evolutes, except suddha, vidya and Isvara, (i.e., sadakhya, sakti and Siva) and soon till in the state beyond the fourth Siva alone is active.**

The Fifth Aphorism

Though the senses know their objects impelled by the self just dealt with, yet they do not know either themselves or the self. Similarly the selves know their objects being impelled by the divinity but they do not know either themselves or the divinity. They are like the iron in the presence of the magnet — This is the aphorism.

Intention :

The intention of this aphorism is to make known the primal Being's aid to the selves (in their objective experiences).

Commentary :

Even though the inner sensoria stand in relation to the selves as the ministers to the prince, yet the self cannot experience the two kinds of state described without the help of the potency of the primal Being. By delineating this help, the aphorism expounds the nature of the material and instrumental cause of the universe which were established in the second aphorism.

In the last aphorism the nature of the self in the state of loneliness was dealt with. Here the state of the self in association is being dealt with. So the ground for the sequence of aphorism is the established order. This aphorism also intends to deal with the nature of the

** The five directive states in the forehead may be analysed into the three kinds of perception, the indeterminate, determinate and experiential. The determinate perception may be split up into two and the various evolutes that are active as explained in the second *sutra* may be considered.

It is generally said by the Siddhanta authors of the two manifestation of Siva's potency, the cognition impels the evolute Siva, the conation impels the next evolute Sakti. These two in combination impel Sadakhya. The predominance of cognition impels suddha vidya and the predominance of conation impels Isvara. Again Siva impels maya of the experiential class, Sakti impels kala together with time and destiny. Isvara impels raga, suddha vidya impels purusa. The seven evolutes from maya form the vidya evolutes of the evolutes that aid the self in experiencing buddhi as pleasure, pain or difference.

bondages which form the material cause and the instrumental cause of the universe. This relevance of the chapter is obtained by the natural desire. Since the last aphorism compares the inner organs to the ministers, it may be concluded that the experiences of the self are due to the various organs alone and not to the divinity. But here the topic proceeds to establish the dependence of the self for its experiences on the concealing potency of the primal Being. Thus the relevance of the topic is obtained by the removal of possible objection.

The objection may be raised from the comparison of the king's function with the help of his ministers and it may be felt that god's help is necessary for creating and absorbing the universe alone and not in the case of the experiences of the individual selves. Since the comparison is only a partial one, that objection is removed here by establishing the dependence of the selves on the divinity even for the sake of their day today experiences. The evolutes are insentient and the self has no intelligence of its own. Even when the self is in combination with the evolutes, it identifies itself with the evolutes and behaves just like the evolutes. So the self requires the aid of the primal Being even in its experiences of the states of consciousness.

Maya and the works are included in the potency of concealment since they are instrumental to it. So the aphorism which deals with the nature of the potency of concealment may be considered to deal with the nature of maya and works. Of these two principles of bondage maya is the material cause and the works constitute the instrumental cause. Their existence has been dealt with in the second aphorism. The aphorisms of this second chapter deal with the nature of the entities whose existence have been established in the first chapter in the inverted order respectively.

Of the five letters Na, ma, Si, va and ya, Na indicates the concealing potency and it is generally held that maya and its works are included in the same letter. Umapati Sivam in the tertiary, Siva-prakasam, (stanza 91) deals with the form 'Sivayanama'. There he says that the self is in the middle, being surrounded by the concealing potency and impurity on one side and the grace and Sivam on the other side. The same author in (Tiruvartupayan stanza 82) describes the meaning of the letters in order by the expression 'Siva and Sakti

and the impurity and maya surround the individual self'. Here it means *na* indicates *maya*. So it is clear that maya and its works are included in the concealing potency by tradition.

The paraphrase of the aphorism :

Though the sense organs perceive their respective objects by the help of the self, they cannot perceive either themselves or the self. Similarly though the selves know and experience the fruit of work in the two series of five states by the help of cit Sakti of the Primal one who assist them in their knowing, they cannot know either themselves or the divine grace that dwells in them and stimulates them.

Just as the attraction of the iron is due simply to the presence of the magnet, so this experience of the self is due simply to the presence of the Primal one who dwells in them and impels them not by action, but by volition. So the Primal one does not, though the self does experience change. The last sentence, 'So etc', is derived by the implication of what is given in the aphorism. Though the sense organs are alone mentioned, the help of the primal one should be extended to all the instruments.

In the aphorism the author has not only stated that the self knows its objects but also says that it does not know the primal one. This is to remove the objection that may be raised as follows :

If the Primal one dwells within and impels the self to know the objects, the Primal one also may be known to the self even as the objects themselves. This aphorism issues into two topics.

FIRST TOPIC

Proposition :

Here the five senses will know their objects with the help of the self.

Ground :

For, they cannot objectify even a single thing unless the self identifies with them and knows the object.

Commentary :

The proposition refutes the view of the Sankhya School of thought which says that the self remains unattached like the lotus-leaf with

regard to water and in the presence of the self the evolute intellect alone knows the five objects through the senses. So according to the view it is not proper to hold that the self undergoes different states of experiences combining with the different instruments. This view of the Sankhyas is being refuted by this proposition and it is established that the senses also are necessary for the experience.

The ground shows the reason which establishes the proposition. In order to show the necessity of the identification of the self, the ground is expressed with two negatives.

The following illustrative verse strengthens the ground by showing the necessity of the activity of the self and also its identification with the instruments while they grasp the object.

V.I.A.

When the self like a king is there ruling the five senses, they do not know the self. The self does not perceive unless it perceives through the senses ; and if the self does not perceive, the eye cannot see and the ear cannot hear.

Commentary : That the five senses do not know the self is common to both the schools, the Siddhanta as well as the Sankhyan. If the senses perceive their objects by the mere presence of the self, they should perceive the self as well by their consciousness that they perceive by the mere presence of the self ; but it is not so. This inability of the senses to perceive the self cannot be otherwise obtained than to suppose by presumption, that the senses are ruled by the self and identified by it while objectifying them through the senses, while they perceive them. This is the import of the first sentence. The second sentence explains the mutual necessity of the self and the senses in objectifying anything ; the true nature of the senses is understood when the self descends to the state of dream from the waking state.

The mention of the five senses and the eye and the ear will indicate likewise all the instruments which are evolved from *maya*.

Second Topic :

Now, even the self will know with the help of the primal one.

Ground :

For, even like the senses which perceive with the help of the self, the self does not know itself.

Commentary

In the first topic it is established by refuting Sankhya School of thought etc., that the activities of the instruments are in need of the potency of the self. Taking that as a similar case the second topic proceeds to establish the need for the aid of the primal one even in the case of the self, refuting the schools of thought that affirm the changelessness of the primal Being etc. This need for help is limited to those things that have a chief, but is not applicable to those that do not function under a head. Godhead whose help for the self is derived from the similarity of the case with the senses. In order to show that the argument does not lead to infinite regress, the Godhead is indicated by the expression 'Primal one' both in the topic and in the aphorism.

The intention is that the evolutes and the individual self have got a principal whereas the primal one has no such principal. This can be seen from the aphorisms that have been studied already.

The ground establishes the proposition by removing the objection that may be raised as follows. In the case of the insentient instruments it is proper to say that they cannot objectify unless they are ruled by and are identified with the self. But the self is sentient. It can experience its objects through the senses even like the eye which can see things as soon as the light is brought in. So it is not proper to say that 'Even the self will know with the help of the primal one', by classifying the self along with the instruments.

The intention of the ground is as follows. Even though the senses are insentient and the self is sentient and so similarity cannot be established, yet they are similar in not knowing themselves and their primal ones. It is because of this similarity the school of Sankhya has been refuted by saying that unless the self is identified with the senses they cannot objectify anything. Hence it is only proper to say 'Even the self will know with the help of the primal one.'

If it be so, the experiences that are got through the sense organs are due to the self. If the sense organs are compared to the self also the experiences that come to the self should be due to the primal one which identifies with the self and makes it know. Thus it leads to an error. To remove this objection and to strengthen the ground the following illustrative verse is given.

2. (a) You have forgotten the scriptural passage * that the world is active in the presence of the eternal Siva. The said Siva as eye the self has a conscious experience according to its work. Since the changing world is nothing before Siva, He will not experience it. You should understand this.

The import of the first sentence of the illustrative verse is that the universe is moved by the Prime Being is not only obtained by the inferential reasoning that is being shown here but also it is enforced by verbal testimony that in the presence of Lord Siva the self acts. You have forgotten this truth and say in contradiction that the self will act even without the help of the Primal one. This is not proper.

The force of this expression that the 'said Siva as the eye' is that the presence is not the mere existence of the world before Lord Siva, but it means that Lord Siva suggests by his divine grace that the world should act in such and such ways. Hence the saying of the school of thought that will not attribute activity to the prime Being is not proper. It is the opinion of this school that the presence of Siva means only the direction of the world in front of Lord Siva being activated by Him without undergoing any change in Himself. The last two sentences of the illustrative verse provide the reason for the experience belonging to the self alone and not to the prime Being.

In the verse the name Siva is used thrice. But they convey different meanings according to the contexts so as to suit each case. The use of the name at first will indicate the meaning of the word that He is the source of bliss. When the same word is used for the second time it means that He is omniscient. The last one indicates that He is the pure Being. Thus at first it indicates the reason of making the

* The scriptural passage referred to may be taken to be (1) the content of the Kenopanisad or (2) the 3rd part of Brhad Aranyaka where it deals with the topic Antaryami.

world active. Secondly the word indicates how the Lord is qualified to enlighten the selves. Thirdly the name indicates the cause for His not experiencing the changing world. These three kinds of interpretations should be seen in the handbook of Soma Sambhu (*Soma-sambhu paddhati*) and also in the introductory stanzas of Sivatatva viveka. Even the author of Sivajnana Siddhi has pointed out that since the world is inert it cannot be experienced by Lord Siva.*

Tirukkalirrupadiyar says in stanza 87 : Even as you are free from the experiences of the works of the worms in your belly, Lord Siva remains unaffected by the birth and death of the selves.

The following illustrative verse explains the relationship of the self with the Lord while it acts being activated by Him.

(b) Even as the planet shines with the light of the sun, but is different from the sun the self perceives the five senses with the help of the Lord though it is different from Him.

The self is neither identical with the Lord nor different from Him but it is inseparable togetherness. This meaning can be derived from the illustrative verse by transferring the adjuncts of the comparison to the thing compared and vice versa. Here the Tamil word 'min' means the planet which shines with the light of the sun and yet is different from it. We should note the usage of the classic Tamil that 'Nal min' will indicate star whereas 'kol min' denotes a planet. Here by the word 'min' the author only means 'kol min'.

The commentator takes it to be 'Nal min' and interprets it as star. But to show that it shines by the light of the sun, he affirms that even stars shine with the help of the light of the sun, which fact is the conclusion of the vedas.

Here the following objection may be raised by those that are not willing to attribute change to the primal one. It is proper to say that while experiencing the worldly objects the self is in need of the help of the Prime Being. But when the Prime Being helps the individual selves, the latter understand and act differently at different times. This difference in the experiences of the selves should be

* Siddhi Aphorism 5, Stanza 6.

attributed to the difference in which the Prime Being causes them to understand and act. Hence it follows that the Prime Being experiences changes which is against the scriptural saying that the Primal one is changeless. Change may be taken to be qualified by adventitious attributes and adventitiousness is to behave different at different times for some reason or other. In order to overcome this difficulty the Prime Being may be compared to sun in whose presence one of this lotus is a bud, another blooms, another fades, whereas the fourth one withers.

This comparison helps Godhead remain changeless while in His presence the selves understand and act differently. But the following objection may be raised herein. The various changes of the flowers in the presence of the sun take place without the intention of the sun according to the nature of the flowers. Similarly it follows that the selves behave differently according to their works in the mere presence of the Primal Being without His intention.

This is contradictory to the established conclusion that the conation, the cognition and the volition of the selves depend respectively on the conation, cognition and volition of the Prime Being and also to the above definition of siva's presence as the suggestion by Him through His divine grace and leads to the school of thought called Isvara Avikara Vada. This is something like falling into the mouth of the snake in order to escape the sting of the scorpion. This objection is removed by the following illustrative verse which deals with the nature of the potency of the Primal Being, which quality was established in the fourth topic of the second aphorism.

Illustrative verse : (C)

The grace of Isa (Siva) is eternally with Him. It is His Sakti (Power); without Him grace does not exist. Without grace He does not exist. To the knowledge of those enlightened by grace, Hara (Siva) is one with His Sakti as the sun (is one with the sunlight).

This illustrative verse says that the absoluteness of God is untouched by the variableness of the self because His contact with the self is through His Sakti or grace. This is something like the following. When a man moves a finite thing through his hand or through a rod in it, the man is not subject to any change.

The intention of the illustrative verse is to show that the Primal Being remains without any change, since all the changes in the world take place through His grace. The grace means the gracious feeling of the Lord in order to cleanse the innate impurity of the self and to identify it with Himself so that the self may enjoy perfect bliss.

In technical terms this act of mercy is called the removal of *pasutva* and granting or revealing of *Sivatva*. The relationship between grace and God is one of quality and the qualified, like the Sun's light and the sun. It is called *tadatmya* in sanskrit, which means contemplative identification (though differently expressed becomes the same on deeper consideration). The nature of the expression *tadatmya* is *it becoming the self same*.

Sixth Aphorism

If the Prime Being is knowable He becomes changing (*asat*). If He is unknowable He is non-existent. Therefore the truly wise say that He is neither, but is spiritual Reality, because He is unknowable as well as knowable. This is the aphorism.

The intention of the aphorism

The aphorism defines the meaning of the terms *Sat* and *Asat*, used in Scriptures.

In the fifth aphorism it was shown that the self knows its objects but it does not know either itself or the Primal one. There the following question will arise. If the Primal Being is unknowable by any means it can as well be conceived as non-existent. This objection is removed here in this aphorism by saying that the Primal Being is not known as an object but it is experienced as a blissful Being by spiritual knowledge.

Also in the chapter on nature of the categories, the nature of the Prime Being is yet to be given and that is explained here. The seventh aphorism establishes the nature of the self. In order to do so the sixth defines the terms *sat* and *Asat* as used in scriptures. The nature of the self is given as *Sadasat* (*sat* and *asat*) in the 7th aphorism.

The relevance of the topic is obtained by the removal of objection. In the fourth and the fifth aphorisms the natures of the causal

states of loneliness and association were explained. This aphorism explains nature of the causal state of purity. The relevance concerned is one of conventional order. By this means the relevance of aphorism is obtained. Of the three entities established in the first chapter it is only the nature of the Prime Being which remains to be given. As this is given in this aphorism the relevance of chapter is obtained. As the general nature of the Primal Being was obtained in the second aphorism itself, it is only the special nature of the Primal Being that remains to be given. It is because of this that this aphorism is placed just before the special section and a beginning of that fact is indicated here.

The paraphrase of the aphorism

If the Primal Being which helps the self know, were of a nature which can be known by sense perception and inference, it would be *asat* (impermanent) like the world. If it were of a nature which cannot be known by any means it would be non-existent like the horn of a hare. Therefore it is a spiritual Reality, neither known nor unknown but unknowable in one way and knowable in another way, by His Grace. It is therefore Siva sat or cit sat ; so say the learned established in true wisdom.

Unknowable in one way is to remain unknowable by the objective knowledge and by self intuition (*pasa* and *pasu jnana*). Knowable in another way is to be understood by the experiential knowledge induced by the grace of the Primal Being.

It should be known that the Primal one is cit (Sivam), because it remains unknowable to the knowledge induced by instruments or to the knowledge induced by intuition (*pasa* and *pasu jnanas*). It is *sat* because it is experienced by the spiritual wisdom gained by the gift of God's grace. The qualifier *siva* (meaning cit or intelligent) restricts the use of the qualified term *sat* (unchanging reality). The subject, Primal Being, of the aphorism is understood from the previous aphorism.

It is obtained that the special nature of the Primal one is *citsat*. All the special qualities of the Primal Being are included in the meanings of these two terms and they may be understood and included.

St. 13 of the garland of three gems of Tiruvidaimarudur says, 'Those that do not see you cannot see even themselves'. Stanza 72 of Sivaprakasam says 'If siva is understood by His grace the self will understand itself by identifying itself with Siva'. These two sayings assert that even the *self* can be understood only by Siva's grace.

Stanza 70 of Sivaprakasam says that *maya*, its effects and the two undying works become enlightened if the self is filled with siva's grace. This shows that the nature of *pasa* is fully revealed only by Siva's grace. Stanza 33 of Sivaprakasam says, 'Unless the self obtains the grace of Siva it is not possible to realize the existence of innate impurity. Stanza 62 of Satamanikkovai speaks as follows : 'Oh ! my father, the world will not ask one to see darkness with a flame of light. But you have asked me to examine the nature of ignorance with the flame of light.' These two verses indicate that the root impurity can be understood only with Siva's grace. So even the self and the bondage may claim to be *Sivasat*. This objection cannot be raised for the following reason. The special nature of the self and the bondage can be understood only by Lord's grace, but their existence can be understood by ordinary knowledge. So they (*pasu* and bondage) are knowable in a way and cannot be equated to the Primal Being.

If it be asked how it is so, we shall show in the following. Stanza 2 of aphorism 4 of Siddhi says, 'Those that have understood the existence of self, may be described as knowers of self.'—this is the wisdom of *Pasu*. The wisdom of Siva is greater than this. In stanza 2 of aphorism 9 of the same work says, 'The knowledge which is the result of one's desire and is of the form 'I am Brahman', is to be pointed out as the wisdom of self (*Pasu jnana*). These two sayings make us conclude that the self becomes the object of wisdom of self and it is also the object of the wisdom which assumes the form 'I am Brahman'. Stanza 2 of aphorism 4 of Siddhi also says 'Leaving the internal organs as manifesting light to the self' and 'conceiving them as something lower than the self'. From these the internal organs which belongs to the class of *pasa* become the object of the self's knowledge which discriminates them and rates them as something lower.

Now when we objectify a pot and express that 'I know this' and that 'I do not know this', the object which is denoted by 'this' is the pot which remains outside ; the term 'I' denotes the self that functions by having the inner sensorium as locus. 'Know' denotes the intelligence of the self and 'do not know' denotes ignorance on the part of the self. Since this process of knowledge is common to all, it is perceptual knowledge that the entities, self in bondage and the bondage are objects of *pasa Jnana* (objective knowledge).

Though the ignorant may think the gross-body as the self, it is clear that 'I' denotes the real self when we say 'I know this', because the experience takes place only at the locus of the *real self*. In darkness a man may imagine a rope to be a snake and say, 'it lies here'. But the pronoun indicates the rope only and not the snake. This may be extended to all cases.

On this analogy, since the ignorant very often assert that there is Lord Siva and that there is no Siva, one may be tempted to say that even Siva is the object of objective consciousness (*Pasa Jnana*). It is not so. When a person says that there is a pot in a locality and that there is no pot there, it is clear that the idea of pot is properly conceived and that pot is grasped by the intellect and is experienced by the self. But in the case of assertion or negation of Siva, the substance of Siva is not experienced even in a general way. So these expressions are mere words and are like the mere love expressions indulged in by an inexperienced girl ; they are not the expressions indicating real experiences. The expression, *knowable* used in the aphorism means only a thing knowable in experience.

The Sanskrit aphorism says that if the divinity is knowable it is *acit* or *jada*. But here (in Tamil) it is said that 'it becomes *asat* (impermanent) if it is knowable.' So a discrepancy of the versions may be pointed out. But it is not to be considered as discrepant ; for the term *asat* also implies *acit* ; hence the use of the term in the aphorism by the author. So to make this implication known the author of the secondary has said, 'A thing knowable is insentient and impermanent', in st. 1 of aphorism 6.

If it be asked whether *asat* will follow from *acit*, 'no' is the answer ; for the impurity, *maya* and work are *acit* (insentient) ; but they are

not *asat*. Though the *pasa* in the causal form may be said to be *asat* relative to the prime being which is ever unchangeable, yet its *sat* when compared to the effects of *pasa*, which are changing and changeable. In the next aphorism it will be shown that the world of effects alone are indicated by the term *asat* here.

This aphorism issues into two topics.

FIRST TOPIC

Of the two topics, the first refutes the opinion of the Naiyayikas who holds that God is objectified by the valid means of knowledge even as the material world.

Proposition with the ground :

1 (i) : All things which are objectified by the sense conditioned knowledge are *asat* (impermanent), for they are not light while yet remaining light.

The qualification, which are objectified etc., is to exclude the substance which can be knowable by divine grace which is called the wisdom of Siva. In stanza 55, st. Umapathi has said in Sivaprakasam: 'know that it is *asat* (changing) if it be the object of the knowledge'. He has also given the description of knowledge that 'it is changing and it is old knowledge which objectifies by identifying itself with the objects.'

The implication of the ground is that the same thing produces the impression that it exists when it confronts us with the quality of *Rajasa* and produces the impression that it is not present when it fades away with the quality of *Tamasa*, chaotic nilness. The whole world is of the three strands of qualities, *Satva*, *Rajasa* and *Tamasa*.

Here the terms *light* and *notlight* are given in the sense *Upalabdi* (the impression of is) and *Anupalabdi* (the impression of absence).

The following illustrative verse strengthens the ground by removing the objection that may be raised by the school of Naiyayikas and similar schools.

There may be some category of things that may be impermanent. But there is no valid means to say that all the wordly things are subject to changes simply because they become known. If that be so, the prime Being etc. which are grasped as per st. 5 of siddhi of supakkam, which says that the eternal verities can be known from scriptures by listening to the interpretations given by the experienced soul and the truth can be further strengthened by contemplation of the truths learnt by employing valid means etc. will become meaningless. Hence this leads to reproach to even yourself. If the opponent approaches this way, the correct answer is furnished in the following:

1 (a). O thou who art ignorant of the nature of *asat* (impermanent), listen to me. If a man who has seen the truth enquires, all things known by the sense conditioned knowledge become *asat* (Impermanent).

The intention behind the expression of the illusrtative verse is that the hearer does not know the nature of the impermanent things, that he should listen is what is said by the author by putting implicit faith in him, that whatever is known to exist will also disappear, that it is only those who know the nature of the permanent will also know the nature of impermanent things and that it is very rarely that men enquire usefully. So whatever is known to exist will also suddenly disappear and will produce the impression that the thing is not present. But the permanent thing which is everlasting will not be objectified by the ordinary knowledge.

Scriptural works are only for those that are neither ignorant nor perfectly wise. So they prescribe methods to realize the truth by stages. The introductory stanzas in Sivajnana Siddhi should be carefully gone through. They say that the aim of the work is to enable the student to realize and experience the truth. This realization and experience will come only through the grace of the realized souls.

Thus the Naiyayikas think that *asat* is a different thing and that it is not proper to say that substance etc. which are *sat* to be *asat* simply because they become known : even if it be proper to call them *asat*, to say that the prime Being is not known because all known things are *asat* is not consistent. This school of thought is refuted and the proposition is established.

But there is another school of thought named Sankhya. It holds all things as sat (real) and for it to call the world of nature as asat (unreal) is an occasion for reproof. In order to refute this school of thought and explain our point of view the same proposition with the ground is given another suitable interpretation even as the chapter in kural, 'Not offending great men' ('periyarai-p-pizhaiyamai') is given double interpretation and is taken to be of two different topics :

Repetition of the proposition with the ground :

1 (iii) All things which are objectified by the sense conditioned knowledge are asat (impermanent) : for they are not light while yet remaining light.

This is to refute the Sankhyas who hold all things to be sat (real).

Wordly things have two states, the effective and the causal. In the effective state things appear in a gross form. They themselves disappear assuming a subtle state while they assume the causal form maya. This change in the states of a thing is indicated by the term asat (impermanent) so far as the effective state is concerned. This is only proper and there is no reason for considering it as defective.

The following part of the stanza strengthens the ground by citing examples which are considered as asat for the above reason :

1. a2. O thou seekest analogies for the nature of those things which may be called *asat* (impermanent), they are writing on water, the dream that takes place and the mirage.

The meaning of the verse is clear : The things that exist at the time of their creation like the writing on water etc. are held to be asat (impermanent) in consideration of their short lived nature. Similarly even the effective world can be described as asat (impermanent) by common consent.

The author of the secondary in st. 3 of aphorism 6; says, 'the world is described as even asat because it disappears having been seen as a thing existent'. Even Tiru-k-kural says in 336 : 'This world has the greatness to say that a man who was present yesterday is no

more to day'. The modification of *asat* by *even* indicates that it should be described as *sat* (real) when its substantial nature is considered.

The analogies are given to indicate different circumstances under which they become *asat* : the writing on water disappears while it is being created ; the dream ceases without having a definite conclusion : the mirage disappears by showing the cause that the hot sun disappears behind a mass of cloud.

The qualification, that takes place, shows that the writing on water etc. cannot be said to be unreal because they actually take place as events. When the experience that takes place in the subtle body is accompanied by strong feelings, the indication is felt even in the grossbody. So the reality of experience is established.

Even in the case of mirage the sight of it as water is the only unreal element in it and it is clear that the mirage is a real phenomenon.

Though the effective world is called *asat* because of its short-lived nature yet since the substance of which it is composed is real the theory of *satkārya vāda* is not untenable.

The illustrative verse here forms two different topics even as the illustrative verse of 1, 2, 1, commencing with the words '*Ilayitta*'.

Meykandar has not chosen to place for discussion, the idea that a thing is a mere void if it be unknowable in any manner, as a different topic, for it is obvious to one and all and there is no such elements as doubt etc. arising thereby, which are necessary for the discussion if it be formulated as a topic.

But the author of the secondary, Arulnandi, in order to obviate the objection that may arise in the mind of the disciple that such things could be described as *Sat*, has expressed as follows :—

' If you call a thing unknowable as *Sat*, '(reality) no purpose will be served. Such a thing cannot be obtainable, nor can we obtain it. It is something like the saying, the garland made of flowers of the sky or the rope made of the hair of the tortoise '¹

¹ Siddhi, aph, 6, st. 4.

SECOND TOPIC (VI 2)

The foregoing topic defined the nature of *asat* (impermanent and mere emptiness) by making known the natures of the knowable and the unknowable. The second topic proceeds to define the nature of *Sat* and thereby establish the special nature of the Prime Being. It removes the doubt that may occur to a hearer in the form, 'What then is the nature of the Primal Being if it be said that it is neither knowable nor unknowable.'

It is to be noted that the connecting word, 'Now', used by the author at the beginning of the topic indicates this relevance of the idea.

Proposition with the ground :

Now it itself which is neither knowable nor unknowable, beyond speech and thought, yet comprehensible should be understood as *Siva* which remains *sat* ; for, if it be light there is no need for enlightening and if it be not light, it can not be made to shed light.

The expression, 'beyond speech and thought' indicates the two ways in which we ordinarily apprehend things. Here *speech* indicates the awareness of the individual self which is manifested by the principles of bondage, *Nada* etc. *Thought* indicates the egoistic or intuition knowledge of the self which is other than that. So the expression means the experimental knowledge which is beyond these two kinds of knowing things.

As the Primal Being remains incomprehensible to these two kinds of knowledge, it is generally denoted by the pronoun 'It' in the grand expressions, *Tattvamasi* etc., and *Meykandar* reintroduces, the term to indicate the *Primal Being* and expresses its import in the terms *Siva* and *Sat*. The meaning of the term *Sat* is expressed in the expression *ulla* (that which remains) in '*Siva which remains Sat*' which he uses.

The Primal Being is neither knowable nor unknowable, for it is beyond speech and thought and is comprehensible by experiential enlightenment induced by His grace.

The ground conveys the idea that for the things knowable by speech and thought special qualifications prescribed herein are not required and for a thing unknowable no useful purpose is served by the special qualifications. So the conclusion that the Primal Being is neither knowable nor unknowable (is not *asat*), is beyond speech and thought and that it is only Siva which remains *Sat*, follows :

In the ground *light* means that which is enlightened.

Here objections are raised from the point of view of five schools of thought, the first being the school of the Māyāvādin.

He says that to hold the Primal Being incomprehensible is correct ; but to hold It as comprehensible is incorrect. For so long as a man is immersed in ignorance the great Bing can be comprehended as the knower and the thing known and *It* will be comprehended if the means prescribed is adopted. If ignorance is completely removed, It cannot be divided as the knower, knowledge and the known. So, it will never be comprehended either as *sat* or as *asat* : it will remain only as knowledge alone. This view is refuted and the Prime Being is shown to be comprehensible in the following illustrative verse.

2 (a). If it be said that He is neither *sat* nor *asat*, then what ground is there for saying that He exists. If the truth seer examines, both what is known and what can not be known in any way will be *asat*. Therefore the truth which is beyond our pointed knowledge is Siva's foot (which is comprehended in transcendental experience alone).

Explanation : If it be said that the Highest entity which is known as parabrahman is neither *sat* nor *asat* as that are conceived in the way of the world, then tell me what the valid means is to know that such a thing exists. If a valid means is cited, then it will be feared that such a thing will become the object of that awareness ; so the answer given by you will be that there is no means of knowing it. But, if one who knows the real nature of *Sat* contemplates, both the thing that is knowable and the thing that is unknowable are *asat*, in the first case the term means impermanent and in the second case it is mere emptiness (*Sunyam*) ; So the parabrahman which is described as *Sat* in the scriptural works such as Chāndogya is the truth beyond the grasp of the ordinary awareness should be concluded as the one described in

the Śaiva upaniṣads and Śivagamas as Śiva the Sat, and not as your asat.

To put it short, what is the valid means of knowing the existence of a thing which is neither sat nor asat ? If it be answered that it is an emptiness which cannot be established by any valid means, in the first topic it was shown that such an emptiness and things that are destructible are both called asat and this will be contrary to all the scriptures that describe the primal Being as Sat. So the Primal Being which is described as Sat in such scriptures should be Sivam which manifests itself in our experiential knowledge, and not asat according to your description. Thus this illustiative verse refutes the view of the Mayavadin and established the manifesting nature of the Primal Being.

(b) The following illustrative verse removes the objections raised by the Naiyayikas and those that were of their way of thinking. They say that the Primal Being is to be taken as comprehensible. It is not proper to say that it is beyond speech and thought. In the ground it was said that if it was light, there was no need for enlightening. But it is not true in all cases. If a known thing is further desired to be known by other means it has to enlighten itself by that means also. For example, if a thing is perceptible it may also be obtained by other means of inference or verbal testimony.

Also the individual self becomes sentient only when in contact with the mind. So when it contacts the mind, either the mind or the self may be said to comprehend the Primal Being. Hence to say that it is beyond speech and thought is not proper.

Illustrative verse 2 (b) :

All the organs of knowledge are impermanent (asat) ; therefore none of them can objectify the Primal one. And even thou, the knower, cannot know It, for if thou knowest, It would be seen as an object other than thou. The knower of the truth knows It only through It (its grace). So the knower cannot experience It as a thing apart from himself.

The meaning of the illustrative verse is as follows. All the organs of knowledge are impermanent and also insentient. Therefore they cannot comprehend the Primal Being. Nor can you comprehend

Him since you need their help because of your innate impurity. If you were to objectify Him, He would be a different object even as the worldly things which give you pleasure, pain or indifference. If you know the truth of how enlightenment comes to you, you will seek the enlightening grace of Siva and through that enlightenment experience Him as a peerless one that is, Bliss. Note that *by It* is taken to mean *by Its grace*.

(c) The school of Patancalas says that to *see it by it* only reduces to seeing It and so meditation is the only method of seeing It.

The following illustrative verse refutes the school of Yogins who prescribe their own method to see the Primal Being. Illustrative verse 2(c), If your method is meditation with the organs, the organs will objectify only the worldly things. If it be a meditation without involving any of the organs, then emptiness is the result. If your meditation does not involve either the presence of organs or their absence there can be no meditation at all. If it be an imaginary one like perceiving the Primal Being which is imperceptible, it is only imaginary. Since the Primal Being is not a mere emptiness, it should be meditated on only with Its gracious enlightenment and your practices of meditation reduce to be imaginary or ordinary.

At the end of the special section the method of seeking the grace of the Primal Being and meditating on it with the gracious enlightenment will be made clear.

The fourth Illustrative verse : is directed against the opinion of the school of Sivasamavadins who say that it is not necessary to know god with His grace. Their contention is that in the freed state the cognitive potency of the individual self does become equal to Siva's potency of enlightenment. In the state of freedom the individual self has the Eight qualities of Lord Siva. So the intelligence of the freed self itself can be supposed to comprehend the Primal Being.

Illustrative verse : The Primal Being is not a thing apart from the individual self, for the verbal testimony speaks of Inseparable togetherness of It with the self. So it is not proper to say that the intelligence of the self will comprehend the Primal Being in its freed state for in that case the Primal Being will be a separate entity. It is the self of the selves and it is their ligater. So the self cannot compre-

hend the Primal Being even as the eye cannot objectify the self which is its lighter. Hence it follows that the individual self should seek the gracious enlightenment of the Primal Being in order to comprehend It. *Mey* in the verse means the self and not the body, as others should construe it.

(e) The following illustrative verse refutes the view of the Sivadvaitins who assert that in salvation the self attains identity with the Primal Being and so it is not proper to say that it is comprehended by the self.

2 (e) The Primal Being is not indicated by mere It by you, even as by the Mayavadins, thereby meaning indescribable. In your school there is also the intelligence which comprehends the Primal Being as It. This comprehension does not preclude the identity of the self with the Primal Being in such a comprehension. The Primal Being does not stand apart from the self in order to objectify it. It is within the self and so the self which comprehends the Primal Being can also be called Siva, the Primal Being.

These five illustrative verses are directed towards enforcing the meaning of the saying that the Primal Being does not only transcend speech and thought but also remains comprehensible. The first verse refutes the school of Mayavadins who assert that the Primal Being is beyond speech and thought and is never comprehensible. The verse refutes Naiyayikas and others who say that it is proper to say that the Primal Being is comprehensible but it is improper to say that it is beyond speech and thought. The third illustrative verse refutes that the Primal Being could be comprehended by yogic practices and one need not comprehend It by Its grace. The fourth verse refutes Sivasamavadins who say that in the state of freedom the intelligence of the self becomes equal to the intelligence of the Primal Being and it is proper to say that intelligence itself will comprehend It. They also object to the saying that the Primal Being is comprehended by Itself. The expression 'Itself' is used in the sense the grace of the Primal Being but the opponent does not give this meaning to the word, and objects to the expression by saying that without knowing the Primal Being one cannot know It by Itself.

The fifth verse refutes the Sivadvaitins who say that in salvation it is only the Primal Being that exists and that to say that the self should comprehend It with Its grace is not proper.

The school of Sivasamavada

Other schools are definitely against the import of the Sivagamas and the requirements of interpretation. So it is proper that these schools are refuted. Among the Sivasamavadins there is a particular class which says that in the state of freedom the self manifests itself the six divine qualities. Independence etc. of the Primal Being, and it will be able to perform the five cosmic functions even as the Lord. This class also is not consistent with the Sivagamas. So it too should be refuted. But there is another class among them whose assertion seems to be consistent with the Sivagamas. Their view is that in the state of freedom the self can comprehend the Primal Being with its own intelligence which is equal to that of Siva. This appears to be proper. They establish it in their own way as follows :—

Meykandar, the author of the primary has used metaphor in referring to the self as the prince. Arulnandi, the author of the secondary has expanded it into a simile and has compared the self to the son of a king who has fallen into the bad company of robbers. When the prince was sufficiently matured the king adopted the means of retrieving him from the bad company and made him enjoy his inheritance.

When the prince is crowned by the king he will no more require the help of the king in order to enjoy his inheritance. Similarly the self which has all the eight divine qualities in the state of bondage will forget them owing to the bad company. He will also forget that he belonged to the same class as the king. Owing to this forgetfulness he will possess only the limited knowledge and action and will undergo the miseries of life.

Now, in the state of release, Lord Siva appears before such a self in the form of the master and initiates and instructs him in the path of realization. He will separate him from the bad company and will tell him that he had the eight divine qualities like Himself. Now such a self will get redeemed from the miseries and will enjoy his natural omniscience and omnipotence together with all the other divine qualities and will become independent in his life of bliss. This is strengthened by the expression of Sundarar who says in the fifth

stanza of the decad of Tiruvorriyur 'I cannot meditate on myself being similar to thyself'. Appar also says in stanza 10 in his reply to the king's men, 'we remain in the eight qualities'. Even other greatmen express similarly. Sivagamas also assert at various places that freedom is to become equal to the Primal Being. From this it follows that the released self comprehends the Primal Being etc. with his own pure potency of intelligence.

This fact can also be strengthened by the inferential reasoning as follows.

'The released selves become equal to Lord Siva, for, it has its cognitive potency cleansed fully of the innate impurity.

Whoever is not equal to Lord Siva is not completely cleansed of the innate impurity, even as the ordinary sakalas'.

Unless in the released state the self becomes equal to Lord Siva, it has no independence. Jnanamrtam says 'Dependence is bondage without limitation' (stanza 10, line 11). Sivagamas also express similarly. So in that case, that is, when the self does not become equal to Siva, even the state of release will become a state of bondage.

Here an objection may be raised. If the selves that attain release become equal to Siva, then it should be admitted that they will also perform the five cosmic functions and in that case our supposition leads to the absurdity of owning a number of gods. This objection is not proper. The five cosmic functions are performed by Lord Siva by His grace. But the released selves have to perform them because they cannot avoid the functions. So they will not perform the cosmic functions wherever they are unnecessary. This is expressed by Arulnandi in stanza 10 of sutra 11 of Siddhi in the words, 'Lord Siva is privileged to perform the five cosmic functions whereas the self is privileged to enjoy its own Sivatva only.'

This way they will construe the expressions in Sivagamas so as to be consistent with their own view and will feel gratified in themselves. They separate themselves as the subtle Sivasamavadins. So it may be asked, 'What is wrong in their view'?

For an impartial person their interpretations will end in nothing and so they cannot be considered to be fit for serious refutation.

But still they have got the initiation ceremony as per the sivagamas and observe the rules of conduct prescribed by them. So it is not proper to denounce them. We have only to exclude them by saying that they construe things as they like. But it may be asked how their strong assertions can only end in mere noisy nothing. In that case, we shall show the inadequacy contained in their assertions.

Refutation :

Simply because the self is compared to the prince, you have taken release to become equal to Lord Siva, we shall ask you the following question. When the prince is retrieved from the bad company, will he remain obedient to the king and do his bidding or will he run a parallel government with the king? If your answer is in the first, then the self is obedient to Lord Siva and you are only confirming our view.

If the prince does the bidding of the king he depends upon the king and it is not your view. If the king resigns himself yielding everything to be executed by the released self it is the view of the pasupatas and is not yours. If you say that the prince will also rule independently it becomes the view of those that believe in many gods.

If the prince does not pay respect to the feelings of the king who had done so much for his reformation and improvement it becomes an evil act, which is condemned by all the scriptures. The comparison of the self to the prince may be taken to impress the fact that the self belongs to the same class as Lord Siva. Even here the interpretation will not help the opponent. The wife of the king belongs to the same class as the king. But she does not have the privilege of ruling the kingdom. In the same manner even though the self belongs to the class of intelligent being even as Lord Siva is, it cannot be said that the self in the state of release can have the privilege of performing the five cosmic functions even as Lord Siva can.

It is stressed that in the state of release, the self is independent. This means that in the state of release the self is not subject to the disciplinary action of Lord Sadasiva, which is imposed on the selves of bondage till they become fit for release. It does not mean that the self is independent of Lord Siva too in the state of release and it can behave in any manner it likes. The released self should continue to be obedient and dependent upon His grace.

Even though the released self is freed from the three cosmic functions performed by Lord Sadasiva, yet the self has to abide in the Lord's service in as much as His special nature is concerned. Sadasiva is considered to be the Lord having the general nature. This distinction may be compared to the life of a student in an institution which imposes the disciplinary rules : but as soon as he gets promotion, he is free from the disciplinary rules. But even then he has to obey the rules of conduct which a free citizen is expected to observe. In politics there are freemen, but no freeman is allowed to be absolutely free. All people are expected to follow the general rule of conduct in obedience to the constitution.

In order to impress this fact on the student Sarvajnaottara Agama distinguishes between Siva and Pati. According to this Agama there are four entities Siva, Pati, Pasu and Pasa. But Sivajana Bodham combines Siva and Pati into one category and speaks of three eternal entities. But still it distinguishes between the special or true nature and the general nature of the entities. Lord Sadasiva is the name by which the general nature of the Prime Being is indicated whereas Siva is the name of the Primal Being indicating His special or true nature.

The sivagamas say that the self is independent in the state of release and is dependent in the state of bondage. The dependence of the self will indicate the presence of impurity. This statement of the Agamas has reference to the general nature of the Primal Being alone. It should not be construed that in the state of release the self can behave in any manner it likes. It only means that in the state of release the self has attained the privilege of abiding in Lord's service and is free from the imposition of the condition of ordinary selves that are in bondage.

The so-called subtle Sivasamavadins do not know this subtle truth. In the initiation ceremony they receive of Vijnana, they are enjoined to surrender themselves, along with their gross body and the actions which they are prone to experience through it. In order that they are constantly reminded of this fact they are also enjoined daily after the worship of Lord Siva to surrender themselves along with the performance, the counting of the name of Lord Siva and

other actions, uttering the mantra which begins with the words, ' Sivo data.'¹

Even this they forget and speak of their independence in the state of release. This their action of retracing their steps in offering themselves as a thing of surrender in the hand of the one who is the greatest among the receivers of the surrendered things is a crime which has no extenuation. To surrender oneself to the Primal Being is to realize the dependence of the self to the Primal Being and to abide in His service without doing anything unless it is allowed by His grace.

It may be said that the surrender is only an imaginary one which is enjoined in order to get rid of the traces of the impurity and so there is nothing wrong in their action. If it be so, let me ask whether that imagination is real or unreal. If the answer is in the affirmation t.e. if the imagination is real, then there is no objection to holding the individual self as being dependent. If the imagination is considered to be unreal, that imagination becomes a waste without yielding any fruit even as a man of hunger is not free from it however much he imagines that he has taken his meal.

Also if the action of the mind, viz. conception or imagination is taken to be ineffective, then several spells and performances which are enjoined on the Teacher and the aspirant to be done in the form of meditation should become ineffective and it will lead to absurdity similar to the pronouncement of the unbelievers. Initiation, worship of Siva, thinking on His spell, meditation etc. are enjoined to be performed through the actions of the mind, speech and body.

A man who meditates on garuda (eagle) does not become garuda ; but it is certain the sight of the person removes poison. So it may be said that false or baseless pretensions also are effective. Here an elucidation on the nature of meditation of garuda is necessary. There are three garudas in the universe : one is the elemental garuda ; the second is the spell that denotes it and the third is the deity that presides over the two and produces the results on the meditator. The meditator will not meditate on his body as the body of the garuda

The mantra referred to is as follows :—

¹. ' Sivo data Sivo bhakta Siva-s-sarvamidam jagat Sivo yajati sarvatra yassiva-sohamevatu || '. Its meaning is, ' The giver is Siva, the experiencer is Siva, the worshipper is Siva ; the Siva who is myself is every where '.

but will meditate on his self with the spell taught him. This meditation on the spell produces the effect of removing the poison in the body of a person bitten by a snake. So the self which like a crystal assumes that nature of the spell meditated on produces the effect. Hence there is no doubt or objection in that case.

Moreover it should be noted that it is only the view of the Mayavadins to demean the worship and meditation that are performed by imagination as baseless pretensions. This cannot be ascribed to the religious philosophy of Saiva-Siddhanta.

If it be so, the valid means of knowledge for the truth of the following three things should be given. The three things are (i) that the individual self assumes the nature of the thing which it contacts, (ii) that it will therefore assume the forms of such spells that are pronounced and (iii) that there are spells that influence all the living beings of the universe such as birds and beasts. If that be the difficulty, we are prepared to give the valid means as the verbal testimony of Sarva Jnanottara in the following paragraphs :

Sarvajnanottara begins by stating that there are four entities pasu, pasa, pati and Siva in its true nature free from the authority of the five cosmic functions. It also defines the four entities by explaining their different natures. This Agama is supposed to be given to Skandha by Srikantha Rudra. Siva is unknowable. It is beyond comparison. It is omnipresent, subtle and stands in its own nature. So Skandha will have the doubt how such a Siva could be known. In order to obviate this doubt Srikantha says to Skandha : 'Even though Siva is of such a nature we shall give you the clue to know its presence.' 'This clue is not known to ordinary persons. We have never explained it to any body. It is to be learnt only from the lineal succession of preceptors'. He also revealed to His disciple the qualities of Siva who is eternally free and told him that such a Siva should be meditated on so as to be one with the self. The technical term used for this kind of meditation is Sivoham (I am Siva).

This meditation which identifies the meditator with the thing meditated on has got the power to make the self lose its limitations and make it know Lord Siva with perfect knowledge of Him. Here a doubt may arise in the mind of the disciple while mentioning the entities and defining them, Siva and the individual self were posed as

two different entities during their mention and definition. But in the clue to know the unknown Siva identity of the two entities is proposed by means of the formula of the meditation, Sivoham. How this difference is overcome? In order to clear the following statement is given. When the self remained a pasu without knowing its true nature, he is combined with the impurity which is called pasutva. Similarly there is no doubt when the self realizes itself and remains Siva, when it is combined with Sivatva. The self should practise the conceptions of Siva and itself with the difference conveyed by the terms para and apara, and subtle and gross. The difference in other words, is the nature of independence of Siva and the dependence on Him of the self.

Again in order that the disciple may not entertain the doubt why should the self have many natures such as pasu, and Siva, being combined with pasutva and Sivatva, the work further proceeds as follows. It begins by saying, 'not only that', and mentions the thing in a concise form and says, 'Do not entertain the doubt why should the self possess different forms such as pasu and Siva. It has all the natures in as much as it has got the property of possessing the nature of the thing which it contacts. Thus we have given in a concise form the nature of the self which may be understood by you'.²

Then it proceeds to expand the greatness of the knowledge of the self which is known thus, the fruit which is reaped by such a knowledge, the means of such a knowledge and the greatness of the person who has such a knowledge. Then it says that a man who adopts this means becomes released and possesses the light qualities which are mentioned as Self's nature. He becomes equal to Siva by possessing Sivatva, being released from birth and death. He is omnipresent by extending his presence both within and without. The work says that such a man need not adopt penance, counting spells, meditation, worship etc. and asserts with certainty that it was the truth and says that this is the final Truth which a man needs to know.

Then it proceeds to expand the idea how the self possesses all the natures and call the self by the six names bhutatma etc., and describes the nature of each. When the self possesses the gross body

¹.
². Sarvedhamatmansanti — yadeva parikalpayet tattatbha
 vatyasandehat sada tatbhava bhavatah // it Syevamatma vignonam kathitantu
 samasatah //.

which is the transformation of the gross elements, it is called *bhutatma*. Then it treats of the variations of speech and when the self contacts these variations, it is called *antaratma*, (the self within).

The same self when it contacts the evolutes which are of subtle nature it is called *tattvatma*, ('the self in the form of evolutes). Even among the evolutes it has different names with respect to the evolutes which it contacts and identifies with. The self is called *purusa* when it experiences the world. Owing to the contact of wordly things, when it experiences pleasure, pain or indifference, it is called *jivatma* (the living self). This self when it thinks of the various spells that denote the various kinds of living beings is called *mantratma* (the self of the spell). This chapter also mentions about the various spells and the ways in which they are to be uttered and counted upon. In these five cases the self contacts itself and identifies with things that are different or separate from it. Separation means things that are objectified by it. When the self is not one of these five natures, it identifies with the Primal Being by means of meditative identity and is called *Paramatma* (the great self). Thus Sarvajnanottara explains the nature of the self both in an expanded and shortened form. This nature has already been indicated in the expression, 'The self has the nature of the thing which it contacts and depends upon'. Of these six kinds the first five are artificial depending upon adventitious conditions whereas the sixth, the paramatma which is the result of meditative identity is natural because of the class of sentiency which is common to both the individual self and the Primal one. Finally the work says that the man who has meditative identity sees the Primal Being in his own self through the eye of grace having obtained plenitude. He can perceive the true nature of all things, gets liberated from the eternal impurity and experiences infinite Bliss. This is the concluding sentence which sums up the ideas that have been already conveyed. Thus Srikantharudra communicated the blissful truth to the deva of Skanda in Sarvajnanottara. This may be expanded in the spirit in which it has been interpreted here.

Even though the topic has been so clearly and cogently strengthened by Srikantharudra and to stress the fact that this idea is most important the Agama itself is denoted by the name 'Sarvajnanottara' (the conclusion of all the agamas), there are commentaries which are strained and which do not observe the principle that among the works on Siddhanta there are two kinds, general and special.

Pauskara, Mātanga, Mrgendra etc., belong to the class of the general. Sarvajnanottara, Devi kalottara and others belong to the class of special. The works belonging to the first class are interested in disproving the theories propounded by the opponents. They spell out the theory of one's own religion in a general way and begin to refute the views of the opposite schools. But the works which are classified as special deal with one's own Siddhanta in detail. So the general works are to be interpreted in accordance with the special ones. The reverse manner in which conclusion is drawn is erroneous. This is the correct way in which the works are to be interpreted wherever they seem to be contradictory.

For example Pauskara while dealing with the means of knowledge of perception, the relation between the object and the senses is taken to be of six kinds, from Samyoga *. This is said as per the school of the logicians called Naiyayikas. Examples also are shown as per the works of the same school. But as per Saiva-Siddhanta the sense of ear is the effect of the evolute *ego*. Sound is the quality of ether. So to speak of the relation of *Samavaya* (inseparable sameness) between these two is contradictory to what is said in the chapter on *pasa*. It is not to be taken to be the idea of the Siddhantin. You will also agree that it is given in a general way in accordance with the other school of thought. In the chapter on *pasa* it was also said that the quality and the qualified, the class and form are not different entities. But here they are differentiated and the relation between the eye and the form of the pot when the former sees it is said to be *Samyukta samavaya*: when the nature of the form of a pot is seen the relation is said to be *Samyukta Samaveta sama vaya*. These are not concepts given in Siddhanta, but were said in a general way as per the different school (the Naiyayikas): According to the school of thought the quality and the qualified are two different entities. The same work, while giving the means of knowledge of pure Maya, had said that there was no action (Karma) in pure Maya. This idea had been attributed to the general nature of the work when we dealt with the two kinds of actions in topic two of the second aphorism. You will also accept that these things are said in the manner of courtesy. So it should be understood that more importance should be attached to

* The six kinds from samyoga are 1. Samyoga, 2. Saiyukta Samavaya, 3. Saiyukta Sama veda Samavaya, 4. Samavaya, 5. Samaveda samavaya and 6. the relation of the quality and the qualified.

what is given in the agamas belonging to the class special than that given in the agamas belonging to the class general.

The general ones are interested in refuting the other schools of thought, giving the truths according to the Siddhanta in a general way. But the special agamas are intended to give the truths according to the school of Siddhanta. Sarvajnanottara etc., do not touch other schools at all, but state the truths according to the Siddhanta. It is because of this truth pauskara does not speak of the truth so earnestly as sarvajnanottara. Expressions such as, 'We have not given out the truth to anybody previously : so listen to my saying now', and 'No book contains any truth beyond this.' These occur in Sarvajnanottara alone. It also begins by saying what is the use in expounding things in a dubious manner which lands the listener in doubt and clarifies that the nature of the self is to shine itself with the nature of the thing which it contacts. Also it concludes by saying, 'we have given the nature of the self in a succinct form ; understand this'.

In Sarvajnanottara there is the expression 'tatdharma dharmi'. This expression may also be taken to mean as a thing characterised by a quality *which is similar to* the quality of the Primal Being. What is wrong in interpreting the expression like this ? — it may be asked. If that interpretation is given, it is contradictory to what is said succinctly at the end. The saying was : 'The self is like the crystal. It assumes the nature of the thing which it contacts. Also this interpretation is strengthened by the following inferential reasoning.

'As the self cognizes a thing by identifying itself with it, it cannot cognize other things ; whoever does not cognize a thing by identifying itself will not suffer from this defect of knowing only one thing at a time, like Siva'.

So the expression *Tatdharmadharmi* will only mean, 'The qualified which has its quality' for its quality is of the thing which it contacts. This interpretation is similar to that of the expression '*cit sanga cit*' which is used in Mrgendra to denote the evolutes Kala etc., '*Cit sanga cit*' will mean only Kala etc., which are sentient because of their contact with the sentient things. According to the requirements of grammar the expression should be *tatdharma dharma* if it should convey the meaning as given by the opponent. But the expression is *tat dharma dharmi*, which only permits the expansion of the expres-

sion in the instrumental case only. If the expansion is otherwise the ending of 'i' in *dharmi* is not proper as per the requirements of Sanskrit grammar. (Bahuvrihi or the phrase which is completed with another word will not have the ending).

If it be so, what is the objection in taking the quality of the self as the adventitious one in as much as it is the quality of the thing which it contacts and not its natural one — it may be further questioned.

To assume the nature, of the thing which one contacts, is not described as an adventitious one. It is common to both adventitious and natural ones. While expanding the expression into six kinds, the first five, *bhutatma* etc., are adventitious ones, whereas the sixth the *Paramatma* is the natural one. Also the ignorance of the self is adventitious because it is the effect of the self contacting the root impurity. When the self contacts the evolutes of *maya* it has the pointed knowledge which is also adventitious. But to assume the nature of the thing which it contacts is a common one to both natural and adventitious ones. The self may identify itself with the Primal Being and come to possess the nature of the Primal Being. Here this nature is a natural one and not an adventitious one.

Now it may be asked that the self shines in the quality of the thing which it contacts. So it has no other quality of its own. Hence what is the objection in taking that the self has no quality. The answer is as follows : If there be no quality, there will be no qualified also. The crystal assumes the colour of the thing which it contacts. Not only that, it comes to possess the nature of the thing which it contacts : this possession is its nature. The eye seems to be light when it contacts light and darkness when it contacts darkness. Not only that, it sees its object whether it is light or darkness, or of any colour.

So it is not correct to say that the self has no quality of its own. If there is no quality there is no qualified thing also. It is only *Sivadvaitins* who speak of the qualified without any quality. So the self not only assumes the quality of a thing which it contacts but it has its special quality of cognizing a thing by identifying itself with it. This truth is expressed by *Umapathi* in *Sivaprakasam* in St. 7 of the Special section in the words, 'The self has the quality like that of the eye which is neither light nor darkness'.

From the above truth the following things should be understood. Among the intelligent beings there is one kind which knows things independently and there is another kind that cognizes a thing by assuming the nature of the thing by its contact. These two are different. The first is the Primal Being and the second is the multitude of selves. The crystal in contact with the gem assumes all the qualities of the gem and so it can be compared to the gem whereas the gem cannot be compared to the crystal. In the same way the individual self when in contact with the Primal one, Siva, it assumes all the qualities of Siva. So it is proper to compare it with Siva, but it is not proper to compare on that account Siva to the individual self. We may say that self is Siva and not vice versa, i.e., Siva is the self. The individual which like the crystal assumes all the properties of Siva, will cognize Siva only. It is because of this limitation the individual self is said to be the bond man of Siva. Similar differences may be understood. It is to convey this idea Arulnandi in his secondary (Sivajnana siddhi) has said as follows :

“Siva and Jiva are intelligent. So it is preferable that they are considered to be equal — so it may be argued. But note the difference in the entities : Siva is intelligent to offer grace : but Jiva is the receiver of that grace and is profited by it. Siva works out bondage, birth and death : Jiva is the experiencer of such things. Siva causes jiva to cognize experience things. Though both are in union yet the jiva depends upon Siva. If Siva is likened unto the self, then jiva is to be likened unto the evolute, intellect. If it be argued that the evolute, intellect, is insentient, then it may be proper to say that the self is insentient in comparison to Siva”.

Also, Sivasamavadin shows a syllogism to prove that the self which is free from all traces of impurity is equal to Siva. From the above argument even that syllogism is to be known as wrong. Even when the self is free from all traces of impurity, the nature of the self is to cognize a thing by identifying itself with the thing. But Siva knows things independently. So the self cannot be equal to Siva even in the state of liberation.

The same argument disproves the conclusion of the Aikyavadins who use the example of water mingling with water or milk with milk for the state of liberation. It also refutes the conclusion of the Siva-

dvaitins who use the comparison of the sky of a pot uniting with the outside sky when the pot is broken, or the water that is prevented from flowing by means of a dam, flows rapidly into the sea when the dam is broken and becomes united with the waters of the sea. The agamas use such comparisons to show how the individual self harmonises with the universal self. The comparison is a limited and partial one and beyond this they express nothing.

Also the liberated self is said to possess the nature of the Primal Being by the use of the expression *Tatdharma dharmi* (the self is qualified by the qualities of it, *the Primal Being*). The import of this expression is expanded and the liberated self is said to possess the eight qualities of the Primal Being. Of these characteristics one is called *Anadi bodham*, apart from the other characteristics such as omniscience. *Anadi bodham* or beginningless intelligence is the characteristic of Siva alone. It is not a quality of the individual self. To attribute it to the released self is due to the fact that the released self shines in the qualities of the Primal Being even as a crystal fully merged in the qualities of the gem in contact. So it is obtained that even the other qualities of Siva are attributed to the individual self simply because of its contact with Siva.

Also in *Pauskara* and *matanga* etc., the self is said to possess the eight qualities of Siva; they do not declare that the self possesses qualities similar to those possessed by Siva. *Tatdharma dharmi* will mean only that the self in its released state possesses the eight qualities of Siva. To give the interpretation to the expression that the self is in possession of qualities similar to those of Siva is contrary to *Siddhanta*.

It is to be understood that the released self should intensely practise the meditative identification with the formula '*Sivoham*', for otherwise the self will not fully merge in the qualities of Siva. If there be any portion of it which does not merge in Siva, it will catch with that portion the world and thus it will cause bondage.

It is because of this, in the initiation ceremony the self is made to merge with Siva by means of the way of *Prasada* and the eight qualities are made to become manifest in the self by pouring ghee at the rate of three times per each quality. Thus the self is made equal to Siva.

If the Sivasamavadins differ from the siddhantins and say that the selves have different qualities which are equal to those of Siva, the following question may be asked. Do you consider the self equal to Siva because of similarity or of identity? If the reply is similarity then there is no speciality in your assertion that the self is equal to Siva. If the reply is identity, then the same thing is called by two names, for in siddhanta the qualified is only the sum total of the qualities and it is not a different entity. It may be said that though the qualities are the same the qualified may be taken to be different, then it is not Saiva siddhanta. In Saiva siddhanta the sum total of qualities itself is the qualified. If that fact is forgotten and the school of Naiyayikas is followed, it is not proper to say that the qualified is different even if the quality is the same. Also in eternal things the school of Vaisesika assume a particular entity called Visesa to differentiate things. In Saiva Siddhanta similar thing is not followed. It is only the difference in the qualities of the thing that makes the difference in qualified also. From this it should be understood that the eternal selves have the general nature of assuming the quality of the thing contacted, but also there is the special nature to each and every self. It is because of that the potencies of the impurity are taken to be many. The different natures of the potencies will be elucidated in the special section.

Also if the self is taken to be equal to Siva, then the classification *pasu* and *Pati* will be improper. If *pasu* is taken to be different from *Pati* because of the difference in class, the nature of *pasu* is only an adjunct which is adventitious and not a class. The distinction between *upadhi* (adjunct) and *jati* (class) should be discriminated and known. The assertion of Sivasamavadin leads to the school of mayavadin, but in siddhanta the class of the self is different from the class of Siva. In other words, the class of the self is to know a thing by identifying with the thing, whereas Siva knows all things independently without identifying Himself with the objects. If the self is taken to be equal to Siva, the impurity which does not hide Siva should not hide the self also. But we accept that the self is hidden by the root impurity. We know also that darkness cannot hide the sun, though it can hide the eye. Also all the scriptures declare that Siva is peerless and there is nothing which is equal to or greater than Siva. For these reasons and others to say that the self is equal to Siva is meaningless.

The self which is subject to the five cosmic functions is dependent. But when it is liberated it is said to be independent—This independence has meaning only with respect to being free from the cosmic functions.

But so far as it cognises Siva and enjoys His bliss by identifying itself with Him, it should be considered to be the bondman of Siva. If the ceremony of initiation and in Siva's worship that follows, the aspirant is enjoined to surrender himself the action of worship and the counting of spells to the Supreme Being.

In Tirukkalirruppadiyar in stanza 46, it is said that the self suffers from dependence and it enjoys bliss when it is independent. The word suffers indicates bondage and the term independence does not mean absolute independence.

When a cloth is bleached it becomes pure to its full extent. So also the self becomes free to its full extent, when it is released of the impurity. Hence the self is said to enjoy omniscience in the state of liberation. But when compared with Siva the self has only limited knowledge; it is limited to Siva's bliss only. Siva knows all things. But the self the bliss alone.

In Sivajnana Siddhi stanza 40 of aphorism 4, says, that the limited knowledge is transcendent and the self enjoys full knowledge. But that full knowledge should be noted to be limited to Siva's bliss by the expression that the state of purity of the self is the attainment of the feet of the Lord, there itself.

If a measure is deeply immersed in the ocean and is enabled to contain water, to its full, it will contain only a measure of water. It cannot hold four measures, so says a Tamil work by Avvaiyar. (Vakkundam, 16). So the liberated self is to cognize only Siva in order to experience bliss. It loses nothing when it is ignorant of other things. Since the self has the property of assuming the nature of the thing contacted, to know more things than Siva is a disadvantage to the self. This idea is laid bare in Unmai Vilakkam by the expression, 'The giver of bliss is Siva, the Lord, whereas this is enabled by the impurity'.

Of the eight divine qualities, the beginningless intelligence (anadi bodham) is one which is proper only to Siva. From this it

should be known that even the seven other qualities are also of Siva only. For these reasons what is said by the Sivasamavadins should be known to be improper. They will interpret the expressions used in some places of the scriptural works by straining them and say that the self in the liberated state becomes equal to Lord Siva. The benefit that they realize thereby is to satisfy themselves and to get the worship and other things of their ignorant disciples. But they are not going to realize what they attempt to prove.

The meaning of Advaita :

The self's becoming equal to Siva depends upon the scriptural expression *advaita*. So the interpretation of that term is to be taken now. The term '*advaita*' is made up of two parts, '*Na*' and '*dvaita*'. *Dvaita* means two kinds. The negative prefix '*Na*' has three meanings, namely, no, not and the opposite. The Mayavadins choose the meaning of *no*, for the negative prefix, and take the expression '*advaita*' to mean '*one*', for the absence of two is not found in any other number than one. Even though the expression is taken to mean one, if that one thing is conceived as the qualified one, it is not purely one. So the expression '*advaita*' will become courteously used one. So it should be taken to mean the great one which does not differ from things other than It, nor does it possess any potential difference by virtue of its being qualified by any attributes. So they are called *kevaladvaitins*.

Ramanuja and Sivadvaitins will take the word '*advaita*' to mean *one* only. But according to them the upanisads etc., speak of the qualities of the Great entity such as *saktisankalpa*, (the will power which is its potency). It is not proper to speak of these attributes as adventitious ones. So the word '*advaita*' means the great entity which is one as qualified by the self and the world which depends upon it and with the qualities such as *saktisankalpa* which are unseparable from it. Hence they are called the qualified *advaitins*.

Madhvas and others who attribute difference in their interpretation take the word '*advaita*' to mean the opposite of the two. But opposition consists always in two things. According to them the term *advaita* will also give the implication of *dvaita*.

All these people give the interpretation of the expression *advaita* as '*one*' and in order to comply with their own favourite concepts

they add the attribute (kevalam) or qualified or opposite, to it. According to Saiva siddhantins the meaning attributed to advaita, as purely one, and the one, which is the opposite of two, are not consistent with the scriptural works. So they are rejected. The meaning conveyed by the qualified advaita is not inconsistent with the scriptures. But it is not the true meaning of the term 'advaita' for if one is its meaning it will be said so expressly and an implied expression will not have been used. Also to take the meaning as one will not help in the interpretation of the grand expressions of the scriptures. The grand expressions are: 'It is He', 'Thou art that and I am He'.

Siddhanta saivites give the interpretation of the term in the following manner. As the disciple hears the grand expressions in the three persons, he entertains a doubt as follows: In the grand expression, 'that' denotes an entity and 'thou' denotes another entity. The expression says 'Thou art that'. How one entity can become another? In order to remove this doubt the term 'advaita' expresses a relation between the two entities, which enables them to be called as the same.

If it be so, it may be asked what kind of relation is expressed by the term 'advaita'. Is it the relation of oneness (Aikyam), Tadatmya (It becoming the same self), inseparableness (Samavaya), contact, the sameness or a different one?

If the answer is oneness as the mingling of river water and the water of sea, or that of the sky of the pot and the great sky outside, when the two entities unite, it is one entity only. So it is better to indicate the relation as oneness there is no purpose in using the expression 'advaita' in order that oneness may be inferred from it. Also the entities become one, the natural quality of the self, that it assumes the property of the thing in contact, becomes absent in the state of release, which is a defect. If it be said that it is Tadatmya, as in the case of the quality and the qualified, the self is an entity qualified like the Primal one and it cannot be said to be the quality of the Primal one; so it cannot be said to be tadatmya; (It becoming the self itself). Samavaya which is spoken of by the Naiyayikas is not a relation different from tadatmya; But it may be said to be the relation of contact even as two fingers placed side by side. Contact is a relation

that exists between two things that have a common portion and at the same time they are separate ; in other parts ; so the relation of Samyoga (or contact) can not be attributed to things that are extensive, if the relation is said to be of the same form basing it on some kind of relevance, it cannot be the meaning of *advaita* which was used to strengthen the meaning of the grand expressions. Also one cannot experience the Bliss of Siva by the relation of the same form. To say that it is inexpressible is the expression used by the mayavadins. If it be asked then what the correct reply is, we give the following :

The relation of Tadatmya is of two kinds : one is the relation of the quality to the qualified or the part to the whole, which is the same thing considered as two. Similarly, two things, will act as one, owing to inseparable togetherness. Of these two, the former is known as Tadatmya whereas the (second) is known as *advaita*. The relation between the power of the eye to see and the intelligence of the self in the act of seeing is *advaita*. In the act of seeing the eye and the self are inseparably together, and they are essentially two things. In other words, if one thing differs within itself and behaves as two as the quality and the qualified, or a part and the whole the relation between the two is called Tadatmya, and if two things act as one, such as the self and the eye in the act of seeing, the relation is said to be *advaita*.

This is known from the nature of the expression ' *advaita* ' itself. It means the inseparable togetherness of two things. The meaning of the negative prefix, *a* or *na* is *not* (Anmai in Tamil). But in Sanskrit it is called Samya or Sadrsya, which is illustrated in the expressions *abrahmana* or *anasva*. The expression *abrahmana* does not mean a non-brahmin. It means a kshatrya or a vaisya who appears like a brahmin with his holy thread : he should appear to be a brahmin, but on close examination he should not be a brahmin. Similarly, the word *anasva* does not indicate any animal that is not a horse : it means only a mule, which appears like a horse, and yet not exactly a horse. So the things to have the relation *advaita* should appear to be two and yet not two. From this it will be seen that the interpretation given by the siddhantin is the correct one ; though two yet owing to the inseparable togetherness they are not two. Also it is useful in interpreting the grand expressions, ' Thou art that ' etc.

This meaning is neither one which is called *Aikya*, nor one and different which is called *Tadatmya*, nor different which is called contact

(or Samyoga) : but it is common to all of them. So in giving illustrations the scriptures give all the three kinds mentioned. Fourth topic of the eighth aphorism of this work (Sivajnana bodham) gives the illustration of the river waters merging in sea water which is Aikya. Stanza 57 of Tukalarubodha gives the illustration of the sky merging with sky and fragrance with fragrance. These are also illustrations of Aikya relation. In topic one of the second aphorism this work speaks of the pitch variation and the quality of the sound. Tukalarubodha in st. 36 speaks of the self and the grace of Lord like water and its taste. These two are illustrations which have the relation of one and different, Tadatmya. Sivajnana siddhi gives the illustration of the attraction of the piece of iron by the piece of magnet which is a relation of difference only. Thus different illustrations given to the same merging should not puzzle the reader. Advaita is different from these illustrations. The special illustration used to indicate advaita is the merging of the intelligence of the self and the power to see of the eye in the act of seeing a thing. So the primary work, the secondary and the tertiary Sivaprakasam use the same illustration of the merging of two things the *intelligence of the self and the power to see of the eye* when they deal with the proper subject.*

This interpretation of 'advaita' is not obtained by modifying it by the attribute kevala (mere) or qualified or opposite but is obtained from the expression as it stands pure, so it is called pure advaita or suddha advaita. The attribute suddha (pure) indicates that the expression is interpreted as it stands unqualified. Unless the expression is attributed by the favourite terms, it will be noted, that the term fails to convey the meaning intended by the other schools of thought.

There is the relation of Tadatmya in the same thing by the concomitancy of two elements in it which differ. Similarly there is another Tadatmya in two different things which are concomitant by means of inseparable togetherness. The latter relation is called advaita by attributing the meaning of *not* (or *samya*) for the negative prefix *a* (or *na*). Those that do not know this give the interpretation of the word 'advaita' as they like. They do not think of the following verbal testimonies : (i) the scripture says that the Primal Being will stand mingled

* 11th aphorism of Bodham and Siddhi and Sivaprakasam st 7 of the Introductory chapter Sivaprakasam uses the term 'Arivu Oli' which means the intelligence of the self and the self and the eyesight.

in and out of all things even as oil is found in sesameseed ; (ii) the scripture gives in a concise form that the individual self has the nature of those things which it contacts and identifies with ; (iii) it also says that though the three entities, the Primal Being, the self and its bondage are equally extensive, as they are gross and subtle as water and oil, they are concomitant—vyapaka and vyappya. They have no experience of such scriptural truths. So they do not think of the cogency in the verbal testimony wherever they expound anything. Naladiyar in the 4th stanza of the chapter on 'Avai arital' (knowing the mood of the assembly) says, 'The ignorant has not learnt anything systematically ; but has learnt an aphorism by mere rote memory from the repetition of the elders. The mere repetition of that aphorism in an assembly of learned men will only expose the ignorance of the person.' These people are the proper examples of the content of the stanza. They forget even what was done to them in their initiation ceremony. After purification of the six adhvas their selves are made to merge with the Primal Being and are made equal to Siva by manifesting in them the eight divine qualities. They cease to be Saivites follow the school of Sankya, and say that the relation between the three entities is only their mere presence and thereby reveal their ignorance. They say that it is called Suddhadvaita (Pure advaita) because of the class of purity that exists between the Primal Being which is eternally released and the self which becomes released in course of time later and become pure. This purity is intended in the expression 'Pure Advaita' for these ignoramuses.

Of the three eternal entities, the self has the property of assuming the nature of the thing which it contacts. So it is gross and its advaita consists in contacting those things and as it assumes the nature of the things contacted it remains conditioned (Vyappya) by the nature of things contacted. This meaning is expressed by the author of the Secondary in the words, 'The self is extensive being attracted and assuming the nature of the thing in contact' (Vacittita varum vyapi). Even in this conditioned state, its contacting other entities which are of a different class and assuming their nature is to be known artificial, because of its contact with impurity. It should be distinguished as being natural, if the conditioned nature of itself is the result of contact with the Primal Being, the inner principle, which is subtle and is of the same class. Otherwise, if it be said that to assume the nature of the Primal Being also is artificial, then it is the conclusion of those

that will say that to assume the nature of the thing in contact itself is artificial. This school of thought was refuted already and hence the distinction should be observed. In one case the self is conditioned by the nature of the things of a different class and in the other case the conditioned nature is imposed by the entity of the same class, which is the inner life of all.

Now, if the testimony to the truth that the self in the state of release will enjoy Bliss is asked, the scriptural saying of Siddhi . ‘ The experience of Siva’s Bliss will become one’s experience ’ (Sivanubhavam Swanabhutikam am) etc. will constitute the testimony. The following inferential reasoning will also be taken to be the valid means : ‘ Siva’s Bliss is a thing to be experienced by the self ; for it is an element of pleasure, even as the wordly pleasure is ’.

If it be so, as all the things experienced are insentient, ‘ Siva’s Bliss also may be classified among things insentient — it may be argued. The counter argument is as follows : We see that all known things are devoid of intelligence, so even if Siva becomes a known thing, He will become devoid of intelligence ; and so Siva should be debarred from the position of being perceived by gracious wisdom ; and if so, He will become a non-entity, which is the very opposite of our common consent. So such questions are not questions at all.

If it be so, Siva the immutable is not known as any other object. He cannot be taken to be devoid of intelligence as any other object : so it may be said. Well said ; The entity which is aware of without the pointed knowledge, will also be experienced in a manner which transcends objective nature. As there is difference even in experiencing it from the other objects, He cannot be classified as being devoid of intelligence as in the case of other things.

Also, all entities that are known to the self are things that are experienced by the self. This concomitance is true in all cases. So Siva’s Bliss which is known to the self will be experienced by the self without any shadow of doubt.

From this argument, the following way of argument is also refuted :—

If Siva’s Bliss is a thing of experience,

What is the form of experience ? Is it of the form of an entity experienced or of the form of mere experience ? Such questions become meaningless. All those things which are known to the self by means of its cognitive potency should necessarily become things experienced by it.

If it be so, it may be questioned by similarity whether all things that are known to Siva are also experienced by Him. The question reveals the ignorance of the author of the question. To identify oneself with a thing known is to assume the nature of the thing in contact. It is the ingress in the thing known which is the meaning of the word experience (Anubhava). This nature is limited to the self alone, and it has nothing to do with Siva. Siva knows all things but has no ingress in them. So all things, are known to Siva and they are His Jneya not prameya. So He will not experience the thing known to Him. Please note this distinction in the knowledge of the self and that of Siva of the things.*

Also the following truth may be borne in mind. Pauskara says in the chapter (patala) on pramana. 'The self is pramata, its potency to know, which manifests itself by the lighter is pramana ; the activity of its knowing is known as *Pramiti* ; all other things are prayameya'. Also it says, 'The pramana will not become prameaya by any means ; and prameya will not become pramana'.

Thus the Agama defines the terms and refutes the schools of Naiyayikas and others by the statement, 'The sense organs etc. which become known as prameyas should not be properly called pramanas'. From this evidence, it is clear that the self's potency to know will never become prameya, either for Siva, or for the self or for the other selves. Its presence may be known as something like the object of the true memory. So the potency to know of the self, though in a way known, cannot become the prameya. So there can be no doubt that it will be experienced either by the self or the other selves or by the consciousness-force of Siva.

If so, it may be asked, as all pleasures are known to be the effects of the deeds performed by the self, if S'iva's Bliss also is classed as

* A thing known with ingress is pramēya ; whereas a thing known without ingress or identification is Jñēya only. All pramēyas are Jñēyas, but all Jñēyas are not pramēyas.

pleasure, it will also be concluded as pleasure, and it will also be concluded as the effect of the deeds performed by the self. This question is raised in ignorance, for, the pleasures that are ephemeral and devoid of intelligence are alone known to be the result of the deeds, but Siva's Bliss which is other than those and is known as everlasting having its source in intelligence has nothing to think of it as the result of the deeds.

If so, it may be questioned, what is the authority to know that Siva's Bliss is an entity of pleasure. If it be said that the term *ananda* used to denote it is the authority, the term only means 'becoming full' in Sanskrit and so it cannot be an authority. But it is not so ; it is the opinion of the linguists who know about Sanskrit that the roots of words will give many meanings. The word 'bhava' when prefixed with different particles will give many a meaning as *Anubhava*, *paribhava*, or *vibhava*. Similarly 'Nandam' which means fullness, when prefixed by a, will properly mean great pleasure. It is because of this, the words pleasure and *ananda* are taken as synonyms. So the term *ananda* itself may be taken to be the authority. Also in *Sarvajnanotara* etc. ; it is said that in the state of release there is *Paramasukha*. So the nature of pleasure is indicated not only by the term *ananda* but also by the word *sukha*. So your object is not fulfilled even when it is taken that the term *ananda* will not mean pleasure.

Now, it may be said by the opponent that the worldly pleasure is nothing but the modification of the *intellect* in the form of the bright quality (*Satva*) after it has had contact with the worldly things. Similarly, it may be said that Bliss in the state of release also is nothing but the illumination of the eight qualities, omniscience etc. Well said ; what is worldly pleasure is the prominent illumination against the self of the quality of brightness which is a constituent of the root *prakṛti* which is other than the self, since experience is only to identify oneself with the nature of the thing contacted ; Similarly, the prominent illumination of the eight qualities, omniscience etc., which are in Siva, an entity other than the self, is what is called the pleasure of Siva's Bliss organizing that illumination by identifying itself with it is called the self's experience of it.

To say that the quality of brightness is the quality of the self and is not of the root *prakṛti* is the expression of those that differ from the usage of the *Sivagamas*.

It may be proposed for acceptance that the wisdom of the self which is of the nature of pasu is the limited pleasure of the world ; similarly, the wisdom of the pure self, in the form of Siva ; is the unlimited pleasure of release. This is not the conclusion of the scriptures. If the wisdom itself is said to be the pleasure, it may be questioned what is the cognitive element which knows it and experiences it ? If the answer is the self's cognitive potency which is the qualified, the qualified will remain mere wisdom and it cannot become opposite so that it may be shown. We have divided the same wisdom as the cognitive potency and the cognizer on the basis that the potency will become opposite and the cognizer will not become so.

If that fact is forgotten and said that the cognizer (mata) can itself become mana, then there is no distinction between mana and mata, the instrument and the knower and there will be no cognizer. If it be said there is a wisdom common to both quality and qualified and that wisdom is called the cognizer, that answer will lead to infinite regress.

The following continuation is taken from the impression of the palmyra leaves preserved in Tiruvavaduturai Adhinam. (See page 189, 3 of my 'Key to Sivajna padiyam'—in Tamil published by Madras University in 1977.)

To say that there is a third element besides conceiving of the same wisdom as two, the quality and the qualified, is to assert against the conclusion Sivagamas. In Sivagamas it is only said that the self's quality is pramana, but it is not said that it is also prameya there. Further the quality of a thing is the thing itself. So to declare that the self experiences itself is the saying of the Maya vadin. For these reasons this view does not deserve to be considered as an opinion at all and refuted.

If it be so, it may be questioned whether Siva experiences Bliss at all. We have given the meaning of the term experience (Anubhava). That nature is limited to the self and is not present in Siva which knows things without ingress. Further Siva's nature is Bliss itself. So it should be known that there is no experience to such Siva.

The next aphorism says, 'The Primal Being does not know things, as in His presence all things are non-existent. The asat which is not

knowing cannot objectify. So, that which knows both the kinds is 'the self which is neither'. This is said because Siva has no experience and the self has experience. It is not uttered in the sense that Siva does not know in general. From the illustrations given there the truth is to be understood.

From these statements let it be understood that the Primal Being is not to be meditated on with the self's cognitive potency and it is to be known by meditating on it with His grace.

Refutation of the school of Suddha Saivism :

Suddha Saivites are the nearest to the Siddhanta Saivites. They do not understand the minute truths. They say that in the state of release the self becomes Siva Himself : it is not true that it stands by knowing It by Its grace. The statement by Meykandar is, in the illustrative verse 2 of VIII, 'As the seer *sees it by Itself* he will not see it as a thing apart — from him'. Here *seeing It by Itself* is only limited to the state of perfection, Jivan Mukti. The said Muktas will experience the fruits of the deeds that are held by that gross body. By this the States of Jivan Mukti and para Mukti have great difference — they say.

Siddhanta :

There is cognition of the Bliss in a transcendental manner even in the state of complete release is to be understood from the following. The state of release is experiencing Siva's Bliss. Unless there is cognition there is no experience. In Siddhi XI, 11, it is said, 'though the two merge, they do not become one, they will be together with inseparableness'. This inseparable togetherness is possible only when the two entities have the relation of the cognizer and cognized ; Sivaprakasam says, 'To give an illustration for the state in which the self is in conscious union with the Primal Being is its union with the root impurity, Anava itself. Here the work uses the term *Conscious* union and it is compared to the opposite state where the self loses its cognitive power in union with Anava.' For these reasons the consciousness in the state of release is to be known.

The following arguments will show that the Suddha Saivites have gone wrong even in their conception of the released state of a

jiven Mukta. In the initiation, the body, its belongings and the self are surrendered to Siva. These three which have been artificially in possession of the self have become the property of Siva after the surrender. The belongings referred to there can only mean *the deeds* which are inseparable from the self even as the body is. It is clear that the term does not refer to other belongings which were eschewed already even before the initiation. Even if the belongings are taken to be all things in common, the deeds also are included in the term. So to own such deeds is reprehensible as to own a thing which have been surrendered already. His action is like that of the Siva Sama-vadin who thinks to own himself as his own even after surrendering it to the greatest receiver ; More over, he himself is not his but the property of the Lord : so there is no relevance to experience the fruits of his deeds.

The three things from the body etc. have been accepted by the Lord is clear from scriptures that say, ' Did you not accept on that day when you took me as your bondman the three things the body, its belongings and myself ? How there can be any obstruction to me, now ? I don't find any compensation for your kindly act. You have made me Siva accepting my weaknesses etc. (Tiruvacakam.)

SPECIAL SECTION

CHAPTER ON MEANS OF ATTAINMENT

Seventh Aphorism

In the presence of Sāt, all are empty and It knows not. Asat is insentient ; so, it cannot know. The knower of both is the self which is neither — is the aphorism.

Conforming to the principle, from the known to the unknown, the author, after giving the general nature of the three entities, has proceeded to give their special nature. Hence this section is called the Special Section.

The general nature has been conveyed by giving the means of knowledge of existence of the three entities and their descriptions. Now he will give the means to be adopted and the results to be ob-

tained. The special nature, unlike the general one, will remain unchanged. So it is also called the true nature. From this the relevance of the section will be known (as of conventional order).

In this section the first chapter is known as the chapter on the means of attainment. It is only the aspirant that strives properly to remove, of the three entities, that which causes pain and to obtain the entity that is blissful, who attains the desired result. So of the two chapters of this section the first is with regard to the means of attainment and the next is with regard to the attainment. When a person knows the description of a thing, he will naturally desire to strive to adopt the means by which he will obtain the desired effect. So the relevance of the chapter is of the natural desire.

The *intention* of this aphorism, which is the first of this chapter, is given in the following words by the author himself :

This aphorism intends to convey a Supplementary to what has been said above.

Meaning :

In the above aphorism where the terms *Sat* and *Asat* were defined, it was said that the thing known or the thing that is empty is called *asat*, and that which transcends both will be called by men of divine experience as *Siva Sat*. The intention of this aphorism which follows it is to express a supplementary idea based upon the truth revealed.*

The intention is given in this manner so that the reader may understand the continuity of thought of the work, though the section is different.

The article *a* is prefixed in order that the reader may understand that there is one supplementary idea only, though there are three topics in this aphorism, the first two leading upto the main idea expressed in the third.

Paraphrase of the Aphorism :

Of the two entities referred to in the 6th aphorism, in the presence of the Primal Being which was shown to be beyond speech and thought,

* (Supplementary idea is the Definition of the self, which is *Sad asat*).

all things are nothing, so the spiritual Sat will not experience the world ; the world which is asat is devoid of sentiency and therefore cannot know or experience Siva Sat the Primal Being. So by the process of elimination, it is only the self that experiences both the world and Siva though it is neither sat nor asat, but can be described as Sad asat.**

The same reason given for Sat not experiencing asat will hold good for asat not knowing sat as well. But to strengthen the idea, the author has given a separate reason. In conformity of the same idea, the author of the secondary has given both the reasons in the words, 'As asat does not stand as a separate thing before the Primal Being which is Sat, and as it is instrumental for another entity to know.'

In the aphorism the word 'know' is used in the sense 'experience'.

This aphorism issues into three topics :—They are (i) Sat does not know asat as every thing is empty in the presence of Sat ; (ii) Asat cannot know as it is devoid of sentiency ; (iii) So the self which is neither, knows both, with both and remains in both :

FIRST TOPIC

Of these three, the first topic refutes the idea that 'Sivasat knows for the sake of the self'. This is advanced by the Sivadvaitins.

The school of thought is as follows : Sivadvaitins hold, even as the Siddhanta Saivites, as expounded in the general section, the descriptions of the three entities, Pati, Pasu and Pasa, the origin and absorption of the 36 evolutes, the five states of consciousness and all. But they argue as follows : the Pasu and Pasa are not separate entities as they are pervaded by Siva. The difference among the three entities Pati, Pasu and Pasa is one of the inner class like the difference which exists between the quality and the qualified and it cannot be said to be external : the branches, tendrils etc, are not different from the tree. Similarly the entities *sadasat* and *asat* should be called *sat* only and not otherwise. So we cannot hold that Pasu can independently

** This aphorism shows that the self is competent to strive for the attainment.

know apart from the nature of pati. So it should be held that pati alone knows for the sake of the pasu, locating Himself in pasu. The question may arise that if all are Sat, then there is no difference between the knower and the known and so how can it be possible to have the activity of knowing.

If such a question arises, the answer is that though there is no difference external, we recognize a difference internal and there is *asat* which is known as *pasu* : so it is possible to know it. If it be said that in the presence of Sat all things are empty and so the Sat cannot know *asat* it is contradictory to the following scriptural expressions :

(i) *Sivaprakasam*, st. 2 which s̥ays : (God) contacts the *kutilā* (Pure *Māyā*) with growing brightness and *Māyā*.

(ii) Topic 2 — illustrative verse 2 of aphorism one of this work says : The selves stand on the feet of the Lord, the main support.

(iii) *Siddhi* — st. 53 of aphorism 2 states : *Māyā* is a potency to the Lord, the blemishless. iv. st. 7 of aphorism 5 of the same work says : The world is the body of the Lord. v st. 56 of aphorism 1 speaks of *adhva* as the form of the Lord.

(vi) St. *Tirunavukkarasar* speaks of the eight components of the world, the five elements, the sun, moon and the self as the form of the Lord — (general — *Ninra Tiru-t-tandakam*). So to say that Sat does not know the world will be contradictory to the above scriptural sayings and will be like the saying of the *Māyā* vadins. This saying of the *Śivādvāitins* is refuted in the topic and it is established that Sat does not know the world.

It is to be noted that the nature of Sat is taken first for the two reasons, the relevance and its Prime nature.

The Proposition :

Here, in the presence of Sat (spiritual Siva) *asat* (the world which is impermanent) will not show itself as a separate entity.

The reason :

For, in the state of release, when the special nature of the self is manifest, the impermanent general nature does not show itself.

Commentary :

The term *Sat* means the permanent, which is the spiritual *Siva*, which is beyond speech and thought. The meaning of the verb 'does not know' is only that the world does not stand apart as to be empirically known as a separate thing, as pot, cloth etc. are objectified by us. It should be noted that the word *sūnyam*, of the aphorism, is not interpreted as denying its empirical existence, its separate, objective existence alone is denied.

The reason advanced is that in the plenary or absolute experience of the self there is no knowledge of the world. This cannot be unless the knowledge of the world is absent for *Siva* also : in other words, *Siva* does not experience the world or He does not know the world with ingress or objectively. The world is only *Jñēya* and not *pramēya* to the primal one.

The terms *Mey* and *Poy* used in the statement of reason will mean only special nature and the general nature of the self respectively : this was made clear when we dealt with *Satkārya vāda* and *Abhāva vāda* in the general section.

Illustrative verse : 1 (a)

This verse says that the fact that the Primal Being has no such sense — conditioned knowledge does not detract from the perfection of His knowledge, for there is nothing apart, for Him to know objectively :

' As god is not separate from *pas'u* and *pas'a*, which are pervaded (*vyapya*) by Him, there is no need for Him to know objectively and He does not possess any such knowledge. If He were to know, He would know it immediately, He being one with it. Just as darkness cannot appear separately in the presence of the sun, the inglorious impermanent cannot appear separately from Him '.

So it follows that the absence of the objective knowledge, which retards omniscience will only add to the greatness of the Primal Being and it will not detract His perfection from Him.

This work in IV 2 has said that the body which is the effect of *Maya* acts like the lamp ; and if the individual self does not know

the world with it, it can have no knowledge. Siddhi in II 84 and Sivaprakasam in I, 25 have compared the native impurity to darkness and the effects of Maya to the light. So the world is not adverse to god : yet the comparison of the world before the Primal Being to the darkness before the sun here is to be taken to be partial, to show that in the presence of the Primal Being the world will not appear as an independent entity.

Topic two

When the Sivadvaitins were refuted, the refutation was accepted by the Siva Sankarantavadin. He says that the self has the form of sentiency but does not objectify anything. In this respect it may be compared to a burning lamp. In the presence of the self, when the body acts like a piece of iron in the presence of magnet, the evolutes experience the things of the world. When the impurity is gone ; the grace of the Primal Being will blend with the self, like the blending of light of the face in the mirror, and be seen on that occasion. This is like the things that have fallen in the field of salt become salty. The instruments which objectify things in the presence of the self will turn into the instruments possessing the nature of Siva and they will know Siva.

Of these the opinion that the instruments will know in the presence of the self was refuted by the arguments which were advanced to refute the arguments which were advanced by the Sankhya in Sutra 5 topic 1., where he said that the five senses would know their objects, in the presence of the self. This topic refutes the opinion that the same instruments will attain the nature of Siva and will know Him. Thus it strengthens the statement of the Aphorism that Asat cannot know.

Even though this topic is to be placed first, there was the location of Sat at first and so it was dealt with at first.

Proposition with the reason :

There is no knowledge to the world of Asat, for, on enquiry it is established to have none.

The word Asat used in the proposition denotes only the world of evolutes, for in other cases, the body, world and things experienced

there is no doubt, if they have the power of understanding or not. The negation in the aphorism with regard to *asat* means only the negation of sentiency.

The reason refutes the following argument which might be advanced by the opponent. When there is no presence of the self, it is proper to hold insentiency to the evolutes. Even in the presence of the self to say that the evolutes have no sentiency does not seem to be proper, for there is the usage of *pas'a Jnana* parallel to *pas'u Jnana* and *patijnana*.

The reason means : Even though in general the evolutes seem to be knowing, when investigated with true knowledge without doubt and error it is established that the evolutes have no knowledge ; hence the conclusion.

The knowledge of the self obtained through the evolutes (*pas'a*) is called *pas'a Jnana* by the usage of courtesy : to take that as knowledge of the instruments (*pas'a*) is the result of ignorance which persists in the absence of investigation.

The following illustrative verse shows by comparison how without investigation the evolutes appear to possess knowledge and how on investigation they become devoid of knowledge.

2 (a) An ignorant man approaching a mirage thinking it to be water, finds it as mirage, when he reaches it. Similarly, an ordinary man who has not received the enlightened instruction from a master is prone to think that there is knowledge in evolutes which are *asat*. But when there is the enlightened instruction from the master, the evolutes become devoid of knowledge. Understand this truth.

Third topic

In the foregoing topics, the school of Sivadvaitins who assert that the self has no other nature than that of the spiritual Siva and the school of Siva-sankranta vadins who assert that the self has no nature at all were refuted. Thus it was established that there is no mutual knowing of the spiritual Śiva who is *sat* and the world which is described by the term *asat*. This third topic of this aphorism removes the objection, if it be so, then what is the entity that knows and experi-

ences both and by the process of elimination, it defines the nature of the self which is sadasat.

The Sivadvaitins hold that the self is of the nature of absolute spiritual reality; so they assert that the Absolute knows the world, the asat. Siva-sankranta vadins hold that the self has no distinctive nature of its own ; so according to them the world knows the spirit, i.e., asat knows sat. The position of the Siddhantin is that which knows and experiences both the asat and the sat is the self : It is neither sat nor asat, but may be called sadasat.

Proposition :

Now it follows that the self which is neither Sat nor asat has knowledge of both.

Meaning :

The expression means that as there is no mutual knowing between sat and asat, (the spiritual permanent and the impermanent) — if it be held that they are not known to the self as well, they will become empty and useless ; so the self certainly knows both of them, as the eye can enjoy both the sun and the objects which have no mutual knowledge of each other. This inferential sentence may be constructed and the meaning understood.

What knows both the sat and the asat, knows them being manifested by both of them respectively and having its life in both of them. It is the self, which is neither and can be described as either, because of its peculiar nature.

Paraphrase : The above sentence expands the full meaning of the proposition as including the instrumental and locative cases as well as the accusative so that the schools refuted may become clear :

The expansion in the accusative case as that which knows both answers the question, if both of them are so, then what is the entity that knows both of them and refutes the schools of Sivadvaitins, Siva-sankrantavadins and the like.

The expansion in the instrumental case expresses that the self knows when helped to know by both Sat and asat and refutes the schools of the Saivites who may be called Samavadins, Avikara

vadins and Aikya vadins, who assert that the self need not be helped to know, but it independently knows both Sat and asat. External schools also may be taken to have been refuted.

The expansion in the locative case refutes the schools of Saivites of pashanavadins and bhedavadins, who say the self does not blend with sat and the school of pure Saivites who say that the self blending with Sat becomes Sat itself and it does not stand as an entity with it; the like schools also may be taken to have been refuted.

From the above the following peculiar nature of the self's knowing will also be obtained : (i) It is different in nature from asat and sat and is like the seeing power of the eye which is unlike the nature of darkness and light ; (ii) that it is manifest only when there is a lighter manifestation and (iii) that it is like a crystal which becomes of the nature of a thing which it contacts and identifies with.

Illustrative verses :

3 (a) The self which learns through books which express subtle meaning knows the sat and asat but is none of them. It does not appear as a third entity, nor does it deny its existence by not so appearing. It appears like the fragrance of a flower which is perceived along with the flower.

(b) Experiencing unconsciousness and then gaining knowledge by means of evolutes which act like medicine, you whose knowledge thus changes are not sat. Nor are you asat since it cannot experience the fruit of its own works.

(c) Non-knowledge which is anava cannot appear before Siva-Sat, which is pure knowledge. From eternity it attaches to the self fit for it, though Siva-Sat was present too, even like salt in the cool ocean water.

Ocean here is the space that contains water.

Commentary :

(a) This supports the idea that it is the self that experiences both asat and Siva-Sat, though it is neither.

The existence of scriptural works shows that the self can know and experience the contents, which are both worldly and the transcendental.

The question may be raised whether such a self will know its own presence or not. If the answer is in the affirmative, then the expression 'It knows both' becomes insufficient. It should be modified and expressed in the form, 'It knows the three entities including itself'. If the answer is in negative, that which is not known in any manner becomes a non-entity. The latter part of the stanza answers this question. The self is not known as an independent entity as *asat* or *Siva-Sat*; nor does it remain unknown. It is known while knowing the two entities, even as fragrance of a flower is known as a part of the knowledge of the flower, though not independently.

(b) This illustrative verse supports the idea that the self knows only when caused to know and thus shows its difference from *asat* and *Siva-Sat*.

Medicine in this stanza refers to food which acts like medicine and removes the disease of hunger.

You are in complete darkness when you are unaided by the *evolutes* (organs). When you have their help you know the things. The *evolutes* are like food (medicine) which dispels the disease of hunger. Thus you change from ignorance to knowledge being unaided and aided by the lighter. So you cannot know like *Siva-Sat* every thing without any change (or aid). Nor are you *asat* which is devoid of sentience, for you know and experience the consequences of the previous works, which the *asat* cannot.

(c) This verse meets the criticism as regards the self being in conjunction with *Siva-Sat* and *Asat*, that *Siva-Sat* would be involved in the cause of the ignorance of the self.

Ignorance spoken of in the previous stanza cannot exist in the presence of *Siva-Sat*, which is perfect and pure wisdom, just as darkness cannot hide the sun. So without affecting *Siva-Sat* it attaches only to the self which is fit for it, like salt that affects not the ocean-space while affecting the cool water of the ocean that occupies that space. Though the self has relation with both *Siva* and the world, the cause of

ignorance will affect only the self which can be affected and not Siva-Sat which cannot be affected by it, like salt which affects water but cannot affect the space which is filled by the water.

Ocean according to the stanza is the space which gives locality to water.

From the illustration the pervading and the pervaded should be understood. Siva-Sat is pervading ; self is pervaded.

In this topic, the self is described to know both Sat and asat. So the following epistemological truths follow and they are to be remembered :

Sat and asat are prameys, things to be known with ingress. The self is the knower (pramata). Its cognitive potency is the instrument of knowledge (pramana). The enlightenment which is the result of such a cognition is called pramiti. Since it is said that the self knows with both, of the two, when it is illumined with asat the pasa jnana, which is manifested by the means of perception, inference and Agama which are different from the self are the lighters, and when the higher knowledge is obtained by Sat, the grace or Sivajnana which is the inseparable support is the lighter. It is because of this, these lighters themselves will be called pramanas by the courtesy usage. Since it is said in the aphorism that the self has knowledge by localising itself with the two entities sat and asat, it is obtained that the self remains identified with both the entities without ceasing to exist.

The Naiyayikas will call the lighters themselves pramanas. This is incorrect. For the variations of the faculty of knowing because of the difference of the lighters the reader is referred to Sivagamas like pauskara.

Eighth Aphorism

When, because of the self's meritorious practices, the Primal one enlightens the self, even as a master, ' being reared in association of the savage-senses you have forgotten your true state ', the self leaves them and attains the feet of Hara in inseparable union — This is the aphorism.

Intention :

If its intention is enquired into, it intends to enlighten the way in which Divine wisdom is obtained.

Commentary :

From the foregoing aphorism, the self has understood that it is competent to strive for the attainment. This aphorism, with a view to enlighten the self to know the best means of attainment how it is acquired and what is the attainment, makes it perceive how its cognition was manifested by *asat* and how it has objectified it, being localised in it, and how it is to be manifested by *Sat* so that it may experience it, being localised in it. (The means of attainment is known as *sadhana*).

When it was told that the self had to know both the entities *asat* and *sat*, there was the objection how the self could have its knowledge with regard to the entities which are naturally different. This topic removes that objection, hence its relevance.

Last aphorism expounded the step *Atma Rupa* and this aphorism expounds the step *Atma Dars'ana*. By this conventional order the relevance of Aphorism is obtained. When the competence of the striver is expounded in the last aphorism there is the natural desire to know the means (*Sadhana*), its attainment and the result ; by this natural desire the relevance of the chapter is obtained.

Paraphrase of the Aphorism :

By the reason of the self's virtue in previous births, god, who has been immanent in the self making it know, now assuming the form of a Guru, initiates the self saying, 'O thou son of a king, falling among the sense — savages and brought up by them, thou hast forgotten thy true greatness.' Immediately, the self leaves the senses and attain the feet of God in inseparable union.

As the senses are spoken as savages, by the figure of partial metaphor, the Primal one is taken as the king and the self as the Prince. The king has the special attributes of the shading umbrella, the crown and the royal chair (throne). The Primal One is the main support and the cause of all the worlds. This is His special umbrella that shades the world. He has omniscience, which is regarded as His crown. The throne is His pervasive nature causing everything to move and

act. The name Hara is due to Him because of his ability to destroy the bondage of the selves. The self is compared to the Prince on two counts ; one is that has the privilege of enjoying the bliss of Hara and secondly it belongs to the same class of the primal Being because of its consciousness. The senses are spoken of as the savage because they loot the wealth of bliss which the selves are entitled to experience and make them lose ethical life.

This aphorism issues into four topics. The first topic is that the self is enlightened because of its virtuous life in the past. The second topic is that the Primal Being Itself appears as the spiritual master. The third topic is that the self has forgotten his greatness because of its association with the savage-senses. The fourth topic is that the self leaves the five senses and attains the feet of Hara in inseparable union.

First Topic :

The first topic discusses the best means of attainment and how it is acquired.

Proposition with the reason :

These selves obtain divine knowledge by the austerities previously performed, for when it has performed carya, kriya and yoga, these meritorious practices show the divine knowledge which is the right path and cause release.

In the proposition, the phrase ‘ austerities performed previously ’ indicates that austerity performed in one birth is not enough and shows that Sambandar too had performed austerities in the previous births even though we have no evidence of the performance of the austerities in this life. Divine knowledge is to know as instructed by the master with the eye of grace granted.

The expansion, in the reason, ‘ carya, kriya and yoga ’ indicates what is meant by austerities in the proposition. Carya has got a separate initiation ceremony whereas kriya and yoga have the same initiation which is known as the special. Hence the Tamil ending of caryai and the Sanskrit combination of the other two. Even though visiting sacred places, receiving initiation etc., are spoken to cause release, it is only the wisdom acquired by the divine grace that is the

direct and best means of release. Without that wisdom none can attain release. All the scriptural statements referring to other means should be considered to be said by courtesy usage. This idea is made clear by the statement of reason by using double negative (will not give release without showing knowledge). Even though the Primal one is able to enlighten the self with His pervasive nature all of a sudden, yet the nature of the self is gross and it can obtain understanding only step by step. The removal of ignorance and the gaining of knowledge of the self may be compared to the removal of darkness and the growth of light in the night during the fortnight preceding the full moon. The steps in which the self knows the truth are (i) the fall of grace. (Saktinipadam). (ii) dislike of worldly affairs, (iii) desire for release, (iv) teaching of the preceptor and (v) experiential knowledge.

Illustrative verses :

(a) Those who performed good practices enter the respective heaven. In order that they may sever the attachment of desire, they are born again in high station for the performance of such works and attain knowledge. So, in their wisdom, say those who have studied.

Commentary :

The above verse answers the objection that since causes should immediately produce their results, the statement that it is only the austerities performed in the past lives alone produce divine knowledge does not seem to be correct.

Meaning :

Whatever is performed with this body in this world will invariably produce the blissful results in heaven. It is only mature practices that will provide suitable environment to get enlightenment, and enlightenment alone will enable one to sever the narrow attachment to the worldly things. This is the conclusion of the scriptural works.

The following illustrative verse answer the question why should carya, kriya and yoga alone should be taken as suitable austerities to grant divine enlightenment whereas it is said as in Naladiyar (st. 8, ch. Meymmai) that all good actions are of the same kind like the colour of the milk of the cows of various colour.

(b). The joy which comes from prescribed acts is like the joy of one who being hungry eats and again hungers. But by these imperishable practices, one gets equanimity of the two-fold acts and attains divine knowledge even there. Otherwise he comes back and gets divine knowledge.

The moral codes that prescribe good actions tell us at the place of prescription itself the end desired. So they cannot grant divine knowledge which causes imperishable result, the release from impurities and the attainment of bliss.

The virtuous practices and the reverse are similar to each other, like fetters of gold and those of iron, in that they both keep the self in bondage and hinders its approach to divine knowledge. But carya, kriya and yoga do not perish like those acts, the moment when their fruit is enjoyed, but grow more and more till the performer finds the master and obtains divine knowledge through His grace. So they may be compared to the use of Amṛta as food.

If equanimity is attained in heaven itself, divine knowledge is attained in that place itself and through it the blissful state. If equanimity is not attained there, the aspirant will have to come back to earth and attain knowledge. The last two lines should be interpreted as follows : ‘Oppil Irappil tavattu an maruvavan : (ovva vidil) vandu maruvavan.’ an = there.

Commentary :

The prescribed acts like vedik sacrifices, are called good acts done towards the selves, for they are done towards the good of the selves. The imperishable acts are done as acts dictated by Lord Siva : so they are called good acts done to Siva (Siva Nalvinai).

Siddhi, II 25 says ‘ Whatever god is worshipped Lord Siva alone recognizes the worship and confers the due fruit ’. So the above distinction may be objected to by some. The objection is the result of ignorance, for the distinction is made not because who recognizes but because of the difference in the intention of the doer. It should be noted that god rewards a person for his acts only as per his *intention*. It is because of this even the gracious acts done towards ordinary selves by the enlightened are classed under acts done to Siva.

It may be asked whether sacrifices which are performed as per the prescription of the vedas which are unlike the worldly acts such as giving water to travellers during hot season, are classified as good acts done to Siva. Even there, if Lord Siva is recognized as the supreme, the acts may be classed as done to Siva : otherwise it is done towards the selves alone, as Siva is considered by the doer simply as a deva as any other deva. But in a general way it becomes an act done towards the Supreme without intention, which will cause the person to love with intention as well in his future acts to Siva. Good acts may at first be classified into two kinds : (i) those done towards the selves and (ii) those done towards Lord Siva, again each kind may be classified into two different cadres : (i) those done with intention and (ii) those done without intention.

These clarifications are intended by Sundarar, when he sings in st. 2 of Tiru Nagai-k-Karonam : ‘Thou hast made me experience the blending of bitter and sweet things like margosa and Sugar cane.’ (Vembinodu timkarumpu viravi enai-t-tirri).

Good acts towards Siva fall into two classes (i) with intention and (ii) without intention. Of these two classes, the class without intention may happen to be an act like sacrifice done towards Lord Siva without knowing Him specially as the Supreme or even done without any intention like the act of a black mouse supposed to be the previous birth of king Mabali, which became the service to Lord Siva in some way.

Now even the acts done towards Siva with intention may be classified as general and special. General is that which is done without the requisite initiation and the special is that which is done with the appropriate initiation ceremony.

Again these two services to Siva, general and special, may be performed with worldly end in view like reputation etc ; in that case carya etc are called those adopted as means. If the services are done from the true feeling of love, then they are called *true services*.

The special services to Siva, adopted as means and true, are each classified into sixteen kinds as carya in carya, kriya in carya, yoga in carya, Jnana in carya, carya in kriya, yoga in kriya, jnana in kriya, carya in yoga, kriya in yoga, yoga in yoga, jnana in yoga, carya in

Jnana, kriya in jnana, yoga in jnana and jnana in jnana. This way the expansion of services may be done in many ways.

Carya etc. in Carya :

Of these, the cleaning of the house of god like removing the dust and washing it with water is called carya in carya. Worshipping any one of the twenty-five forms of Siva or Lord Ganesa etc, one of the forms found in the surrounding temples is called kriya in carya. Meditation of one of these forms is yoga in carya. The experiential knowledge gained by these services is called jnana in carya.

Carya etc. in kriya :

The collection of all the aids required in Sivalinga worship is carya in kriya. The worship offered to Siva in the form of Sivalinga as prescribed in Sivagamas with the preliminary five purification,* is kriya in kriya. The same worship performed mentally by adopting three places in the body for the three respective divisions of worship is yoga in kriya. Here it should be noted that the place of navel is the locality of fire worship, the locality of heart is the place of worship proper and the mid point of the brow is adopted as the place of meditation. The experiential knowledge gained by the practice of mental worship is Jnana in kriya.

Carya etc. in- yoga : Control of mind, its proper direction, practice of the proper position of seat and the proper control and direction of vital air constitute carya in yoga. Assuming the prescribed forms of mind and one pointedness constitute kriya in yoga. Meditation is yoga in yoga. What is called samadi is jnana in yoga. This yoga is of two kinds Salamba and Niralamba. Salamba yoga, is performed with respect to the form and the form with the formless of god ; the yoga or meditation which is practised with respect to the formless of god is called Niralamba yoga.

Carya etc. in jnana.

Now of the four divisions of Jnana, listening is carya in jnana, reflection or thinking is kriya in Jnana. Arriving at the right conclusion is yoga in Jnana and steadiness is jnana in jnana.

* Purification of place, that of aids, that of mantra, that of the devotee and that of the Sivalinga are the five purifications.

Of these, the sixteen steps from carya in carya to jnana in Jnana of the classification of *means*, the result is the four kinds of release with respect to the localities of the kalagni Rudra to the Rudra who is just below Srikantha Rudra who resides on the head of the evolute guna. Of the twelve kinds of good deeds to Siva of the True classification from carya in carya to Jnana in yoga, the result is the appropriate status of release of the four kinds from the locality of Srikantha Rudra upto the locality in evolutes just below the evolute Suddha Vidya. They are Suddha kala etc. The result for the three kinds of aspiration below jnana in jnana is the attainment of apara release of Mantras and Mantra Mahesvaras who occupy the localities in the evolutes of pure Maya which are classed as adhikara and Bhoga.

The result of the final Jnana of the various Jnanas is para Mukti or the final release : all others who stood in the various kinds of jnana enjoy the localities in the evolutes of Laya classification which are also apara in nature.

Some will say that those who stood in the steps classified as True carya etc. attain saloka etc. in the pure evolutes, Suddha vidya etc. But it is the conclusion of the Sivagamas that apara release in Siva evolutes are due only to those that are relieved of the impurity called Anava. The distinction between *apara mukti* and *pada mukti* (apara release and release in a locality) should be understood clearly. Apara mukti is attained only by those who are relieved of the impurity, Anava. Unless a person has the divine knowledge, he is not relieved of the impurity of Anava.

Sivajnana siddhi VIII 25 says, 'Those who stood in the three steps of path of Siva, yoga, kriya and carya, attain the defectless *release of locality* and at the end of the aeon if the Lord does not offer His grace, are born back and reach Him by attaining the path of knowledge'. Then those who attain *locality release come back*. But Sivagamas invariably say that those that attain release in the evolutes of pure vidya etc. do never come back. So their sayings which are contrary to the dictates of Sivagamas are not correct and the intention of some agamas which speak of the attainment of the evolutes of pure vidya etc to those who pursued the paths of carya etc ; is that they had stood in the paths of carya in jnana, kriya in jnana etc.

Now we shall define carya etc.

Carya

Siva, who is Saccidananda, limitless, eternal and omni-present, assumes the three forms gross, subtle and subtler in order that the selves may profit by knowing Him step by step. The ways of worshipping these forms are expounded by Him in the Scriptures of vedas and Agamas. Those who cannot understand fully, first know Him as the gross form and offer worship to this form as per agamas by using their physical body alone. This is carya. This gross form is called Sakala.

Kriya

As this practice increases, worshipper grows more intelligent and is able to know that god is in the subtle form of Sakala Niskala and the Sakala form is His worshipful body, and offers worship as per the dictates of the Scriptures with the external and internal acts. This is kriya.

Yoga

This practice improves the wisdom of worshipper and his understanding becomes deeper still. He recognizes the subtler form, the Niskala as god Himself and understands the gross and subtle forms viz., the Sakala and the Sakala Niskala as the bodies of Niskala, while the Niskala is being worshipped. Understanding thus, he worships the Niskala with the internal action only as per the scriptural dictates. This is yoga.

Jnana

The practices in this way cause true knowledge of the worshipper and enables him to realize that the true nature of the divine is saccidananda, limitless, eternal and omnipresent, whereas the three forms hitherto worshipped are the bodies of the Supreme, and worships it with the acts of pure cognitive potency alone through the four steps listening etc. This form of worship is Jnana.

Hence all these four kinds of worship are of the general forms of knowing and may be called jnana and yet as they are the steps in the growth like bud, blossom, fruit and ripe fruit, the fourth alone is the fulness of Jnana. As knowledge grows to its fulness, the effect

of Anava, the ignorance, grows less and less and so the results of these four kinds Saloka etc are really the releases and yet the fourth and the last one Sayujya is the release in fulness.

The nature of Saloka etc.

Of the four kinds of results, the result of carya is to enter the world of the deity and have the freedom like that of a servant to move everywhere in the world and enjoy the fruits thereof. This is Saloka.

Samipa is more than that : the worshipper has the freedom of a son to reside near the deity and enjoy the fruits thereof.

Sarupa is higher than that : the worshipper has the freedom of a friend and enjoys having equal form, ornaments and blissful existence like the head of the world.

Since these three results are like those of a servant, son and a friend respectively in the matter of privilege, the means carya and others which enable one to have these results are respectively called the paths of a servant, son and friend respectively. (Dasamarga, Satputra marga and Saha marga).

Sayujya (Becoming equal in almost all respects).

Sayujya is the result of Jnana which has its part in all the four means carya, kriya, yoga and Jnana. It is not merely the possession of the like forms of the heads of the various worlds and having the pleasing experiences. But it is also being fit for the representation of those heads and thus living blissful existence : This is like the power to represent the heads in their absence.

The defect in defining Sayujya as acting as the heads of the worlds concerned instead of being represented by them as above must be appreciated. In the former case the question will be asked what will happen to the original head when the new head happens to become the head by virtue of attaining sayujya. If the answer is that the old head will remain without any duty then his position becomes useless. Also till the release is attained, it is usual for the desire to do work to grow more and more, and so it is not possible for the head to remain without doing anything. If the new entrant is supposed to do his

work, then the further question may arise, whether the new entrant will cancel the orders of the old head or if there will be some division of work between them, the supposition leads to an absurdity being open to adverse criticism. So the definition of sayujya as acquiring equal potency and privilege as the old head of the world ends in the defect of similitude.

The terms fall of grace (Saktinipadam), the ripeness (or maturing) of impurity (Mala paripaka), and Equanimity of two-fold acts (Iru vinai oppu) should be properly understood.

The nature of Sayujya which is the result of the final status of knowledge will be shown in future. It is to be held that Jnana or knowledge is the primary result of carya etc; and Saloka etc are only supplementary results.

Fall of grace (Saktinipada) :

The grace of the supreme at first works through the root impurity as screening potency (Tirobhava Sakti). Now it has been stated that the asterities are of four different kinds and when they affect and act on the selves they may be of various kinds even among these four divisions. As these are adopted by the various selves as their means, according to the means adopted, the screening power acts at first favourable to the impurity when the impurity becomes mature, it transforms itself into grace itself. This is called the fall of grace (Saktinipada). This transformation takes place, step by step, like the stairs of steps between two floors. These steps may broadly be divided into four, slower, slow, quick and quicker (Mandatarā, manda, Tivra and Tivratarā) even though there may be many intervening divisions. Thus the cause for the fall of grace is the ripeness of impurity and so it follows that the latter also will take place in a number of ways.

The nature of the term Saktinipada gives the meaning *the fall of grace*. Sakti means Grace and Pada means fall. The particle *Ni* gives the meaning 'in an increased way'. If a stone falls in the midst of a gathering of people, it will make the members disperse away from the gathering. In a similar manner as soon as the fall of grace takes place, it will make the self concerned to be afraid of the company of wife, son and such relatives, leaves them and approach

the true master. Similarity of this fact made the coining of the term, fall of grace instead of Happening of grace. (Sakti nipada).

The ripeness of impurity (Mala pari paka)

The ripeness of impurity is its becoming associated with all the instrumental causes that are necessary to make it wear out in its power.

Equanimity of two-fold acts

We shall state what is meant by equanimity of two-fold acts, which is the result of imperishable austere practices some will say that when the accrued acts begin to yield fruit as per their nature the best of good acts, horse sacrifice, and the worst of the evil deeds the murder of a sage becoming mature to yield their fruits at the same time and they will cancel each other like Sunda and Upasunda.* This cancelling, they say, is the equanimity yet others will say that the whole of accrued good acts and the whole of accrued evil acts becoming equal and cancelling each other, while yielding fruit, is equanimity. When the best and the worst of the accrued acts become equal and cancel each other, there are the remaining acts whose fruits should be eaten up. The sum totals of good acts and evil acts cannot become equal : if they are supposed to become equal, it is not proper to hold that there by the spiritual impurity will be worn out : also the doers may at best will become vijñanakalas with the spiritual impurity alone. The pauskara refutes these two cases by citing them as they are given here. So these are not to be considered as the significance of equanimity. These two concepts are in this manner are found to be defective or not suitable. Then the following consideration will enable us to arrive at the true concept.

We can neither give any other significance. Sivaprakasam gen. II 30 says that the agamiya (gross acts done with the feelings of desire and hatred) also becomes equal owing to the results yielded by the acts that put an end i.e Siva Nalvinai or Siva punya**. This becoming equal cannot otherwise be obtained than to suppose that equanimity is the balance of mind which does not react to either pleasure or pain, and their causes viz. the good or evil act done with the

* Sunda and upasunda are two demons of equal strength and ferocity : they fell in love of the same lady and killed each other because of the enmity or jealousy.

feelings of desire and hatred. The significance of the fall of grace and that of the maturation of impurity are evidenced in one's cognitive potency. Similarly the significance of equanimity should also be manifested in the cognitive potency of a person. So equanimity should be taken to be the balanced view of a person who perceives the mischievous tendency to cause birth and death in the likes and dislikes, and thus remains colourless in his mental attitude towards good and evil acts and their results, worldly pleasure or pain. The appreciation of this truth requires certain amount of subtlety of conception.

The author, Umapathi, who has defined equanimity in the words : 'Agamya becoming equal due to the results of the acts that put an end' in the tertiary has questioned as follows in Sankalpa Nirakarana. 'The subtle acts may become balanced, but the coming acts cannot stop ; when a person does an act it cannot split up in two : tell me how the acts become equal'. This question is put against those who explain the equality of two-fold acts in this way variously.

There are persons who interpret the term (etirvinaiyum) (agamya also) by making it a different clause in the stanza beginning with the words 'Inaiyapala' in their own way. The inappropriateness will be understood from the arrangement of the words. The 'um' at the end of the word 'iru payan' should be taken in the continuative-additive sense like the two other 'um's'. To separate that term and attribute the meaning of fulness to 'um' is not proper.

Also they have betrayed their ignorance of the rule of grammar by unnecessarily indulging in ingenious interpretation of the word 'Nukar' as the verbal noun. Tolkappium of 'col' in *idai iyal* says that, 'the ending of *um* in some places will assume the form, 'undu'. Accordingly, the author has given the form 'Nukarundu', but it means only 'Nukarum' meaning experiencing (the results). They expand the word 'Nukar' with the local case ending *kal*. They do not even understand the sense from the use of 'at a time' and 'in the past' (*oru kalattu* and *mundu*). The defect of similitude in their interpretation is also seen by making the expression meaning 'The results experienced in the past and to eat at a time' becomes useless making the part 'andam-ura vanda vinaiyum' alone meaningful.

Now the two acts fall into two different kinds, as good and bad acts done towards Siva. So even the equanimity of the acts fall into

two classes, that with regard to two-fold acts done towards the selves and that with regard to the two fold acts done towards Siva. Equanimity with regard to two-fold acts towards Siva is the equality of good and bad acts towards Siva in the conception of a person who leaves even good acts towards siva as it will cause rebirth as it is, like the bad deed, done with the self's knowledge, which is coloured by I and mine : it is done in forgetfulness of the Lord's grace which always activates selves.

Of these two equanimities, the equanimity with regard to the two-acts towards the self takes place in general good acts done to Siva. This general Siva—good acts was said to take place even in good acts towards selves and is classified into intentional and unintentional. This equanimity will happen in the first kind of fall of grace which is called *Manda tara* ; This will happen through making spiritual impurity mature. The equanimity of acts towards Siva will happen in the four kinds of fall of grace which incidentally resolve into many kinds. This will finally cause divine knowledge.

It should be clearly understood under all places that divine knowledge is caused by the austere practices carya etc ; and carya etc are caused by the fall of grace which is classified into four kinds, mandatarata etc. The root cause for all these should be understood, from the writings at various places, to be the ability of the selves to know, which can happen only in stepwise. The cause for such ability to know is the act of grace the Primal Being which is always looking at the nature of the selves even when they are immersed in darkness owing to the bondage of impurity in the kevala state as well.

Topic Two

The previous topic explains how Enlightenment that results in release is caused by doing austere practices, such as carya etc. The purpose of this topic is to remove the doubt whether carya etc practised will directly confer enlightenment.

Proposition with the statement of reason :

Now, these selves, the Primal one alone will enlighten even as a spiritual master, for, He is in union with the form of consciousness without being different from it.

This topic explains that enlightenment, which is the result of carya etc as per the previous topic, will of necessity be imparted by a spiritual master and states his characteristics.

The term, 'now' means when the three means, carya etc, have been practised. These selves means the selves that have this maturity.

Since it is impossible for any one to know the maturity of the selves, unless it be for the Primal Being who has been enlightening the selves from within, the author has mentioned, 'the Primal Being *alone*.' The adverb *alone* separates the Primal Being from others. With this intention, the author of the Tertiary has said, 'The disease within will be known by those within; and not by worldly men outside'.^{*}

The word *alone* added to the Primal Being may also be taken to indicate His high degree of graciousness. Here spiritual master indicates the human form.

The statement of reason removes the objection that may be raised here as follows : The supreme who is imperishable will not possess the form of maya '*.' If He possesses, then He will become one among ourselves. Also the Agamas say that the supreme will enlighten by taking the support of the form of guru as His locality. So to say, 'in this wise' here will be contradictory to them.'

The meaning of the statement is :

The Primal Being stands identical with the pure selves like the self in the body, by means of union.' So it was held that He *alone* will enlighten these selves.

Since it was established in the general section that the Primal Being is the same as the self, like the self in the body by its union it is used as reasoning here by the author. The term, consciousness (Caitanyam — in the original) means the *pure self* by the process of suitable interpretation as in the expression of Sivaprakasam, like *consciousness and light* (Arivoli pol)'. If instead the term is interpreted *the self* in general, the statement of reason becomes applicable to the ordinary selves as well, and has the defect of Indefiniteness : also it does not answer the question raised therein.

^{*}1 St. 2 of Tiruvarutpayan, Arulnilai.

² Refutation of Saiva-vadi, 1.26 of Sankalpa Nira Karanam.

If it be so, the next question is how does it answer the question raised? We shall explain: 'some Agamas say that the Primal one will take the place of the support of the form of guru: this is because the primal one is different from the selves, His individual nature being considered. Here the saying of the author, that the Primal Being appears as the spiritual master is because of His identity with self from the point of view of His union with the self as in the case of the self in the body. So these two statements are not contradictory. Also the stanza of Sivaprakasam, "Mayai *mayeyam* maya varum iru vinaiyin vaymai aya aruyirin mevum arul enin oliay Nirkum." The maya, its effects and the two acts that continue imperishably are of the nature of light, if grace is filled in the self — asserts that the body of the pure self is of the nature of grace. So the assertion of the aphorism that the Primal Being assumes the form of the spiritual master is proper.*

That the stanza of Sivaprakasam referred to cannot yield any other interpretation was said in an expanded form in II (ii) when we dealt with the topic of two *acts*.

The following illustrative verse answers the question why in certain cases god does not appear in the form of a guru while imparting knowledge.

2a. To the vijñanakalas He enlightens from within. To the pralayakalas, He imparts true knowledge appearing before them. To the ignorant sakalas, He imparts it, concealing Himself behind a guru.

Meaning: To the vijñanakalas affected by Anava alone enlightenment is caused from within. To the pralaya kalas, affected by Anava and karma, god assumes His natural form of performing cosmic functions with four arms, three eyes, black-throat etc, stands before them and imparts knowledge by seeing, touching and speaking. To sakalas who are affected by all the three kinds of bondage, He conceals Himself behind the form of a spiritual master and removes the bondage in several ways.

* The reply might be given in the following words also: Knowledge of the divine is imparted not by human agency as in the case of the arts and sciences or as in the case of Nyāya and śāṅkhya systems. Also god does not dwell in guru as adhithana but He is present in the guru by possession (āvesa).

Also refer to Tiruvācakam beginning with "Tandaturannai" where the seer speaks of god as "Thou who hast taken as your locality my body" —udal idam konday.

In the aphorism the release of the *sakalas* (of ignorance) alone is considered, hence the mention of the form of the spiritual master alone is stated.

Of the three kinds of selves, while imparting knowledge of release to *sakalas*, the Primal Being takes the human form of the spiritual master as his support ; hence this mode of enlightening is called supported (*Sadāra*). In the other cases as there is no support, they need, they are called unsupported (*Niradara*).

The following verse gives the reason for the variety in the ways of enlightening and strengthens the statement of reason.

2b. Selves do not know unless they are caused to know. This is done in the way appropriate to the way they can understand. For those who need the instruction, the Lord , who needs no help, supply their needs directly and indirectly. For those who do not need, He supplies enlightenmet from within, and grants deliverance.

From this verse it should be understood that the selves will understand things, only by identifying themselves with the things, and it is possible for them to identify the things only when the potencies of the root impurity leave them. But the potencies are of various kinds and they can be broadly divided into three kinds the grosser, gross and subtle. Those who are clutched by the grosser potencies are called *Sakalas*, who are affected by all the three kinds of bondage, *Anava*, *karma* and *maya*. Those who are clutched by gross potencies are affected by two bonds *Anāva* and *karma* ; even though they are connected with all the three, they are not affected by *maya* and they are called *pralayakalas*. Those who are bound by subtler potencies are affected by *Anava* alone, though they are connected with *Anava*, *karma* and *maya* they are not affected by the latter two and they are called *Vignanakalas*. Hence they require to be treated according to their needs and hence the three broad divisions in the ways of enlightenment brought to them by the Primal Being.

To the *vignanakalas* and the *pralayakalas* the fall of grace (the descent of *śakti*) will happen in two kinds, as per the maturation (or ripeness) of impurity, *tivra* and *tivrata* ; they are enlightened as per these two kinds. Those that are enlightened by means of *tivrafall*

are placed to enjoy *apara* release and those that are enlightened by *tivrata* fall will be granted *para* release itself. For the *sakalas* who have the grosser potency of impurity the maturation of impurity and the consequent enlightenment will take place in one of the four kinds of the descent of grace, *mandata*, *manda*, *tivra* and *tivrata*. So the Primal Being will enlighten them in one of the four kinds and place them in the states of *Sataka*, *Jivanmukta*, *apararelease* and *pararelease* respectively. The initiation ceremony which accompany the grant of the enlightenment was elaborated in the commentary on the introductory stanza.

The interpretation of the verse is also given as follows : The selves cannot know unless they are caused to know. In order to make them know the prime book and other books which are contradictory to one another have arisen. Without following those defective books, those who follow the *Siddhanta* scriptures, which have no such defects, will attain release in the same birth in which they follow the works of the primal one.

The following illustrative verse stresses the need of a spiritual master even though there may be books which can be read and learnt in the form of language but can confer no realization :

2c. Good disciple of austerity, the breast milk and tears of a mother are but visible at the sight of the babe only : Who will know Him, the invisible like the shadow of water, if He does not reveal Himself as a spiritual master.'

Explanation :

Woman's milk and tears are the visible forms of invisible love. They are not manifest before she sees her babe but remain in her unmanifest, like the shadow of water, which remains invisible in the blending of light. So also the invisible god can be realized by the mature self only when He reveals Himself in the form of a spiritual master.

That the breast milk and tears will manifest love will be seen from the stanzas of *Triu-k-kalirrup--padiyar* and *Tirukkural* respectively.

Kaliru st. 54 says : *Mangaiyarkkarasi*, the *pandiyan* Queen had manifested her breast milk when she heard that child *Sambandar*

had divine enlightenment when he drank the cup of milk offered by Uma, the consort of Siva at Sirkazhi : what a great loving mind she had in her ! Thirukkural, 8, 1 : reads : 'Is there any latch to hide even love ? The drops of tear welling up in the eyes of friends will certainly proclaim it !'

The breast milk and tear are only forms of love and not any other thing can be seen from the fact that they appear when there is cause for the appearance of love and does not appear when there is no cause. In order to show this parallelism, the author has said that the milk and tear which are not seen previously, because visible, when the babe is seen. From this illustration the doubt how the Primal Being does become the spiritual master is also removed.

Since the living beings in water move in it, we note that there is sky in it. Since there is sky in it, it is obtained that there should be the shadow of water. Since, the shadow is blended with light in water, it does not appear even as the existence of water. Similarly the consciousness which is Siva is blended with the consciousness of the self in the form of 'I'. In order to bring out this truth the author has worded, in the stanza, the Primal Being which exists invisible like the shadow of water.

The shadow of water is the illustration for the existence of a thing which is invisible. Since this explains the existence of the invisible thing, the illustration for visible things (milk and tear) is given separately.

THIRD TOPIC

In the second topic it is established that the Prime Being alone comes as the spiritual master and enlightens. If it be so, it may be argued as follows : Hither to the five senses behaved as the instruments of the bound self : when the impurity matures and is removed, they will act as instruments of Siva and will enlighten Siva; to suppose that the Prime Being becomes spiritual master in order to enlighten becomes excess and unnecessary. This objection may be raised. This topic removes such an objection being raised.

Proposition with the statement of reason :

Now, these selves, being confused by the five senses, do not know themselves, for, the five senses show what they show, as the colours in a crystal.

The adverb *now* expresses the relevance shown above. *These selves* ; means the selves that can understand when the Primal Being in the form of spiritual master enlightens them. The five senses indicate all the evolutes of maya in general.

The statement of reason removes the doubtful objection raised as follows : In the general section it was said that the selves lose their intelligence because of the root impurity, and they will have their intelligence revealed by the use of the evolutes : but here it is said that the selves will become confused because of the presence of the senses. Is it not contradictory ? The statement of reason means : Things of varied colours placed near a crystal show their individual colours only, hiding the true nature of the crystal. Similarly, the senses show the knowledge of objects shown by them, and they do not enable the self to see its own nature subjectively. Hence the confusion of the self and its failure to see its own true nature. Even among the objects each evolute shows the nature of the particular object alone, which it is capable of. So to show the true nature of the self the presence of the spiritual master is necessary.

Even when the spiritual master is present, so long as these evolutes are present they will reveal only the nature of the objects, and in their absence complete ignorance (kevala) the effect of the evil principle will be the result ; how are we to gain the real knowledge of the self ? This question is answered by the following illustrative verse.

VIII 3-a.

Like the crystal which displays many colours, the self thinks (with the grace of the spiritual master) how the self displays in itself the nature of the objects that are revealed by the sense organs. Thus it discriminates its general nature which is the result of its identification with the sense — organs and becomes identified with the Primal Being in order to perceive its true nature. This identification with the Primal Being which is Sat, is its surrender, the highest form of worship. At that time the general nature (of the self) will become separate from its special nature, which is that of Siva, the Sat.

The import of this stanza is that it is ignorance (or loneliness) if the evolutes separate themselves from the self without action. But if they separate themselves while they are active, because of the

separation of the self, which leaves them after knowing the true nature of itself from the spiritual master, the state is called pure ; so there is no preventive cause to know one's true nature, because of the reason that the evolutes reveal to the self what they reveal. Siva-sank-ranta vada is the nature of the school refuted in this topic.

THE FOURTH TOPIC

Introduction :

In the third topic the nature of the evolutes was explained and showed that the self cannot know its true nature because of its attachment to them. Thereby the import of the second topic is strengthened by saying that the appearance of the spiritual master is necessary. Now the objection can arise as follows :—

If it be so, even if the Prime Being appears in the form of the spiritual master and enlightens, how is the self to know without these evolutes ? This objection is removed in this topic.

Proposition with the reasoning :—

When this self sees itself different from the senses, it reaches the blessed feet of the Primal one :

for, it is like the mother earth becoming the support, when the swing-rope breaks.

The meaning of the proposition :

The self, which was confused by the senses, realizes in the presence of the divine preceptor that it is sentient and pervading and to such a self, the evolutes which are insentient and limited will be of no use in knowing its true nature. Since the self knows it by the grace of the spiritual master, that knowledge itself makes it attain the feet of the Primal Being without any other cause.

The statement of reason removes the objection that may be raised in the form, ' Though it may be possible to reach the feet of god thus, is it possible without any effort on the part of the self by mere enlightenment ? '

The analogy of the breaking of the swing-rope proves that even during the time of bondage the real support is the Primal Being which

is analogous to the mother earth which is the main support of the walls of the beam to which the rope is attached. Only when the rope breaks, it is realized that the ground had been indirectly the support of the swing. In like manner, even the world, to which the self is attached during its state of bondage, has for its support the Primal Being. Hence it is by enlightenment alone the self realises that the grace of the Primal Being was its main support and falls on it.

It should be concluded that if the evolutes separate themselves from the self without being known to it, the root impurity becomes the support, and the self is plunged in darkness. If the self knows the evolutes and separates itself from them, Siva, the source of light of grace is the support. So no effort is required besides enlightenment on the part of the self.

Here a doubt arises. When the self without knowing the nature of evolutes separates itself, 'it falls into the state of ignorance, which is called loneliness (kevala). After some time we see the self associating with the evolutes and reaching the state of association (sakala). Similarly even when the self separates itself from the evolutes and reaches the pure state by attaining Siva, is it possible for the self to get reattached to the evolutes and reaching the state of Sakala. The following illustrative verse clears this doubt.

4 (a). The potency of the self is restricted by the objective knowledge provided by the evolutes even as large quantity of water is prevented from flowing into the river by means of a dam. When the dam bursts, water will flow rapidly into the river and reach the sea and merge itself therein without return. So also, when the self escapes from the restriction of the evolutes by the grace of the spiritual master, it attains the ever lasting feet of undying Hara, and merges inseparably in him and does not get back.

The knowledge provided by the evolutes is called *pasa jnana* (wisdom gained through bondage). The qualification *undying* in *undying Hara* indicates that the potencies of bondage are subject to decay and so the self which has the state of loneliness will have the state of association ; but since the potency of Siva that is grace is undying, the self which reaches feet of god will not return (to the state of association).

Here the following doubt may arise. Siddhi viii84 says ' Even in wakeful state put forth effort so that the state of Turiyatita may appear and the evolutes that are instruments of the bound self may, actually reveal the nature of Siva '. Sivaprakasam, Special, sec. 30 has also said, ' If grace is the nature of the self, its adjuncts maya, mayeya and the two fold acts that continue without destruction will act like light '. From the above it will be clear that even the wisdom of bondage is the wisdom of Siva like the instruments of the bound self. Also st. 11 of kaliru speaks of the comparison of the water reaching the billowy sea coming back in the river partaking the nature of the sea, leaving its own nature.' So the self that has attained the feet of the undying Siva, may get back to the objective region without any impairment. So what is wrong in getting back to worldly life for a person who has attained the feet of Lord ? This doubt is removed and the previous statement is strengthened by the following illustrative verse :

4 (b). If all things are He, there is none to reach His feet. If He is other than any, He is not the Lord. The (other) senses do not like the eye perceive. When sight is regained by the blind, see the triumph of the eye.

Meaning : God is in the self's sense-conditioned knowledge as well as in its grace given knowledge. Just as the sense of sight is superior to the other senses, knowledge imparted by divine grace is superior to knowledge imparted by the senses.

This verse deals with the contention of the Sivadvaita-saivas that it does not matter, when selves have come to see all things as absolute spirit, whether they unite with senses or not.

The answer is that Divine intelligence is at work in both the divinely imparted knowledge and the sense conditioned knowledge : This fact does not make the two of equal worth.

If there is no difference, there would be no need to leave the sakala state to reach the sacred feet of god. Also texts of vedas and Agamas say, ' Deliverance is the self's leaving pasa and attaining the Lord '. But if it be said that god has no connection with sense-knowledge it would be derogatory to His godhead. So the truth is some thing like this. Although the self is in all the five senses alike, four of them perceive only those of their respective objects, which

come to them where they are. But the eye, passing every where, by its light sees even an object which is at a distance. So, though god is in union with both forms of knowledge, they are not of equal worth. Sense knowledge is limited where as the knowledge imparted by grace is unlimited, and it does not bring back two-fold act and rebirth to the self.

The wisdom of bondage and the wisdom of the self in bondage may appear to be almost equal during the state of bondage : but during the state of release the wisdom of self will be found to be unlimited whereas the wisdom of bondage will be limited.

Intention of this verse, in other words :

When the self is released from bondage and attains Sivahood, the instruments of pasu are said to become the instruments of Siva. So the wisdom of pasa even like that of pasu becomes wisdom of Siva. So if the self returns to the world of senses there is no impairment. Why should the previous verse say definitely that there would be no return to the world of senses — This is the objection raised by the Sankranta vada Saivites.

Answer : Siva can neither be identified with nor should be declared to be different from the other two entities. So the relation should be said to be non-difference like the relation between the body and its owner. But while referring to it, it should be noted that though the self is equally identified with all the five senses, the remaining four differ from the eye. This difference is not perceptible when the eye loses its sight. But it is perceptible when it reaches its sight. Similarly the limited nature of the wisdom of bondage and the unlimited nature of the wisdom of the self is not seen in the state of bondage, but it is certainly seen in the state of release. So the unlimited nature of the released self will not return and fall back upon the senses even though they become of the nature of light.

St. Manikkavacakar has said in Nittal Vinnappam 12 : ‘ Magnificent, you take me as your servant : but I hold to the five senses and am prone to leave you. But don’t leave me’ ! Elsewhere also he says like this. So it is obtained that those that have attained the feet of undying Siva return to the world. So it is not proper to say that those released selves will not return. This doubt is removed by the following illustrative verse :

4c. O thou, the end in the end, who hast learnt that thou art not like the five senses, the sakala who has left the senses and united with Siva will not leave Him, even like the senses, which do not leave him. If impurity, and karma dispersed return again like water-weed, he would leave them by meditating Him who never leaves him like the bondage.

Meaning :

You have attained the tivratara descent of Sakti in the fourth which is tivratara descent of Sakti. You have been shown that you are not limited like the five senses in the state of release in the previous stanza. So leave the association of the senses and identify yourself with the Lord who will not forsake you even like the senses of a sakala. At the fall of the stone, the weed that covers the surface of water will leave the place and when the effect of the throw is lost it comes back and hides the clear surface of water. Similarly the three principles of bondage, the impurity, the twofold act and the maya will come back when you are loose in your grip of Siva. So meditate on Him ceaselessly and leave the principles of bondage.

The purpose of this verse is to show that in some cases if there seems a return it is because of the residuary effect of the bondage, which will be overcome by the released selves by their intense meditation on the feet of the Lord.

The three verses of this topic respectively declare that the self that have attained the feet of the Lord will never come back to worldly life, that it is an impairment to come back and fall upon the knowledge caused by bondage, and that in case if the released self returns by the effects of habit it is necessary that it should leave the bondage. Thus they strengthen the meaning of *alone* in the expression that *the mother earth alone* is the support of the swing-board.*

* The difference in the interpretations of 'andatarā' in the commentary and in the small paraphrase is to be noted : The commentary takes it to mean, 'Tivratara in Tivratara' fall of grace: the small paraphrase takes it to mean 'the grand expression of Siddhanta — Sivattvamasi (thou art Siva). In the small paraphrase the term *anta* means siddhanta, by omission of the first part and *tara* means 'grand expression' : but in commentary 'anta' and 'tara' are taken to be the fourth in the forth-end in the end.

NINTH APHORISM

See the Lord in consciousness with the wisdom of the Lord,
Who cannot be seen by the defective eye¹ and bondage,²

He becomes the cool shade when the bondage is abandoned
as the fleeting mirage :

Letters five as prescribed will be pondered over — is the
aphorism.

Intention :

The intention of this aphorism is to tell how to purify the self.

Introduction :

This is the third aphorism of the chapter on Means of attainment. Of the three entities that are posited in the general section, release is to abandon the entity which is to be abandoned and thereby be free from the consequent suffering and attainment is to attain the entity which is to be attained and thereby enjoy the consequent blissful existence. The seventh aphorism has shown that the self is competent to get release and attainment. The eighth aphorism has expounded that the discriminating knowledge alone, which is realised in the presence of the spiritual master, as to what to be abandoned and what to be attained is the best of the means : it is also set forth therein that that knowledge will be realised only when the fall back upon the bondage is ceased and so it is not to be attained by the knowledge provided by the bondage. Now a doubtful objection may arise in the following form. The knowledge gained by bondage is limited : so it is proper that the spiritual wisdom which will apprehend the all-pervading Prime Being cannot be obtained by it : but the knowledge of the self is pervasive and so that knowledge itself may be sufficient for the purpose.

The removal of this objection is the purpose of this ninth aphorism and through this purification of the self it tells us what exactly produces that knowledge, how to obtain it and how to make it permanent. Thus the intention of this aphorism is to expound the adoption of the means of attainment.

¹. Defective eye means pasu Jnana (the wisdom of the boundself)

² Pasam means the knowledge caused by pasam or evolutes (pasa jnana).

Relevances :

The last topic of the last aphorism said that the Primal Being cannot be realised unless the self is released of its fall back upon the bondage. It gives rise to the objection, if so, whether the knowledge of the self in bondage can realise it. This objection is removed here. Hence we obtain the relevance of the topic. The sight of the self (Atma darsana) was dealt with in the last aphorism. Here the purification of the self (Atma suddhi) is being dealt with. By this conventional order we obtain the relevance of the aphorism, last aphorism dealt with the means of attainment. Here the way of application of that means is being dealt with. This fulfilment of natural desire accounts for the relevance of the chapter.

If it be so, the self is called pasu, only when it is bound by bondage; as in the last aphorism the fall back upon the bondage was dealt with, and it involves the removal of the bounden state of the self, there will arise no doubt. If said so, the answer is as follows : This question is being dealt with in future. So it may be taken that the doubt will arise.

Let it be so, Sivaprakasam — sp. 21 defines purification of the self as 'leaving the service of the self' : that leaving of the self's service is expressed in the next aphorism by the words 'stand in the service of Lord'. Also, as purity of the cloth consists in its leaving its dirt, so the destruction of bondage is the purity of the self ; that destruction of bondage is stated in the next aphorism. This ninth aphorism speaks of the sight of Siva (Siva darsana) in as much as it is stated 'See the Lord' and 'the Lord will be the cool shade' in this aphorism. So purification of the self, which is the intention of the 10th aphorism is given by the author as the intention of the ninth. Is it not creating confusion? — one may be tempted to ask. The answer is : 'From the wording of the aphorism it is clear that this aphorism purports to speak of the sight of Siva and the next one speaks of the purification of the self. But to indicate that the purification of the self is caused along with the sight of Siva and to make the disciple understand that these two aphorisms purport to speak of one continuous topic, the author has given his interpretation thus.

In viii4, it has been said, 'when this self sees itself different from the senses, it reaches the blessed feet of the Primal one'. So the sight

of the self itself leads to the final attainment ; then why should the topic of purification of the self be taken? What is the use of this further action? These questions are to be appreciated as being relevant, understanding, the reality is of three progressive steps : they are : the indefinite perception, the doubtful perception and the clear perception. Some advanced selves obtain simultaneously all the three kinds of perception of the reality even when they listen to the spiritual master. But to others perfect understanding of the truth takes place in steps by the processes of listening, contemplation, and clear vision. So it is definitely necessary that after dealing with the Siva rupa, which results in the sight of the self, to deal with the sight of the grace of Siva which results in the purification of the self. From this understand the difference among the three steps, the form, sight and purification (uruva, darsana and Suddhi). It is only with this intention, the author of the secondary has said in Siddhi, aphorism 8, st. 9 ; ‘ Those who came to remain under the feet will eternally remain so having the blissful experience : but to those who alternate between that place and this an account of their desire, we shall relate the way in which they can cut off the bonds ’.* The ten steps of realization are spoken of as Dasa karyam in works like Unmai nerivilakkam one of the fourteen Siddhanta works and Tanikai-p-puranam by the disciple of Sivajnana munivar. The following details are to be understood. To know the actions of the evolutes is uruvam of evolutes ; to know them as being insentient is their darsana and to know them as capable of removal from the self is their suddhi.

To know the self as the knowing Principle is its uruva (form) ; to know that it is moved by Siva is its darsana or sight. To be an entire instrument of god is its purification.

Though all the four functions of the primal being are referred to as the functions of Siva : yet the first three are to be known as the functions of grace and the fourth alone is of Siva, the qualified. To know the existence of grace is its uruva and to know the grace to be the moving principle of the faculties of the self is its darsana. Siva yoga is to know that the self depends for its actions on Siva's grace. Siva Bhoga is the identification of the self completely with Siva and

* In a way Sivajnana bodham is complete in eight aphorisms. The remaining four are related with respect to the general kind, who attain perfection at steps.

enjoying His bliss. The three functions of the evolutes lead to the form of the self and Siva-yoga is equivalent to the purification of self.

Paraphrase :

Let one see the Primal Being in one's consciousness by searching for it with the spiritual wisdom granted by it. It cannot be realized by the wisdom of the self or the knowledge derived from bondage. That spiritual wisdom will appear like a cool shade in the midst of hot environment of birth and death if the world of bondage from earth to nada is abandoned as being impermanent like the fleeting mirage. In order that the spiritual vision which is seen with the wisdom of grace may be maintained in steadiness, the letters five will be meditated on in the manner they will yield the same result.

Of the five syllables, Siva Ya na ma, Si points to the Primal Being ; va to the Light of grace, which is the quality and nature of Si. ya indicates the self, the self-consciousness. Na points to the screening power of god, which includes maya and karma and ma, the evil principle, Anava. As it is instructed in the aphorism itself to abandon the bondage, the two syllables (na and ma) are to be omitted and the required form be taken as the form Si va ya or yavasi : This should be taken as the form to be used in meditation for the complete release. The prescription is obtained in the wording of the aphorism itself.

This aphorism issues into three topics. They are (i) Discover the Lord in consciousness by spiritual wisdom ; (ii) He becomes the cool shade when the bond is abandoned like the fleeting mirage., and (iii) In the manner prescribed will be pondered the letters five.

THE FIRST TOPIC

Proposition with the statement of reason :

Now see that primal one with the spiritual illumination alone ; for, He is comprehensible though beyond speech and mind.

Explanation :

That Primal one means the Primal one which cannot be seen by the imperfect eye, the self's knowledge, and the knowledge provided

by the principles of bondage. The spiritual illumination is the vision granted by the light of grace of the Lord.

The statement of reason gives the valid means that points that the Primal Being which is not to be comprehended by the two knowledges can be realised by the spiritual illumination vouchsafed by the grace of the Lord.

The meaning of the statement of reason was explained, when Sat was defined, in aphorism 6, topic 2. Even though the Primal Being is beyond speech and thought, 'it is said to be grasped by understanding : it shows that the Primal Being is to be realized only by the spiritual vision granted by the light of grace. This is self evident by the means of Presumption (Arthapatti). This is the implication of the author, who has formulated the topic.

At this stage the Siva sama vadins, who presume that the self is equal to the Primal Being say that it is proper to say that the Primal being cannot be comprehended by the wisdom of bondage. When the bondage is removed, the self's knowledge becomes all pervasive, as that of the Primal Being. What is the objection to saying that the Lord is comprehended by such a self's omnipresent knowledge ? What is the necessity to bring in god given spiritual illumination, here ?

The illustrative verse answers the questions :

1 (c) The self with its own wisdom inquires whether I am (the self is) the respiratory system or nerve or bone, or fat or phlegm and fails to discover what it is. But it remembers how it inquired and discovered its true nature by god given wisdom. So those who know god at first by His grace, and then the nature of themselves, cannot know their true nature unless it be by His grace.

The implication of the above verse is the content of the 36th st. of Tukai aru bodham : ' If the self knows its consciousness by itself then it will not find itself in association with bondage for so long a time. So realize that the grace of Hara is like water and its taste inseparable with the self's consciousness.'

Nerve etc. also indicate the other evolutes and their products. This verse refutes the Siva sama vadins and strengthens the proposition that the true nature of the self will be realised only by the wisdom

of grace, as it is realized only after realizing the Primal Being by the spiritual wisdom granted by that Being.

The following illustrative verse answers the question, since the eye can see an object not only placed in front of it, but also the object placed on the back-side by taking a turn, why is it not possible for the self to see, god as well while it can see the constituents of the body such as nerves, bones etc.

1 (b) The eye which can see its object cannot see either itself or the self which enables it to see. So also the self which can see other things can neither see itself nor god who makes it see. God is hidden in the self like a thief. So see Him there.

Meaning :

Objects whether placed in front or on backside can be seen by the eye. But the eye cannot see itself : nor can it see the self which makes the eye see. So also the self which can objectify things which are other than itself cannot know either itself or the Primal Being which is the mover of the self. But the self is not insentient like the eye and god hides Himself like a thief in yourself unlike the self in the eye : So see the Primal Being in yourself.

The Primal Being is compared to a thief because he cannot be seen either by the knowledge of the self or that of the bondage. The author of the secondary has expressed the meaning of this verse in the words, 'He is present as the shower without being seen by the evolutes'. From this understand that the knowledge of bondage and of the self know only the objects (para prakasam), and they cannot reveal themselves. But the wisdom of Siva can reveal not only other things but can reveal itself (tar prakasam or Sivaprakasam).*

TOPIC TWO

Introduction :

In the first topic, it has been said that the only means to attain Siva is to see the Absolute in one's consciousness with Sivajnana

* In the brief commentary, it has been said that for those who see Him in their own consciousness, the hiding of the thief is prevented and He can be seen. For this, the commentator quotes st. 23 of Tiruvundiya which runs as follows : 'With the thief if the owner of the house has mingled, every thing will become open (or exposed).' Thief here is god and the owner of the house is the individual self who occupies the body.

(granted by god). Immediately the natural desire occurs on the part of the disciple to know how to get at Sivajnana. The fulfilment of this desire as a supplement to the first topic is taken as the second topic.

Proposition with the reasoning implied :

When the various colours which are impermanent are seen to be impermanent what thus remains permanent is to be understood as that very consciousness of the Absolute reality (even as the true nature of the crystal).

This statement of Meykantar is the paraphrase of the second part of the ninth aphorism in metaphorical language with the implication of the reasoning and it defines the way in which spiritual illumination comes.

As in other statements the proposition and the statement of reasoning may be separately stated thus :

When the impermanent world is seen as impermanent, that which remains permanent is the spiritual illumination, for it is like the following case : when the various colours which are different from the nature of the crystal are seen as impermanent and rejected, that which remains permanent is the nature of the crystal itself.

If the various colours are taken to represent painted figures on the wall, then the spiritual illumination may be taken to be the wall which is permanent, whereas the painted figures represent the impermanent things that hide the true nature of the wall.

The following hints may be mentioned from the commentary. The word 'bondage' (pasam of the aphorism) is taken to mean the effective world whose form is not permanent, but which hides the spiritual illumination. Rejection for the self (which is pervasive) is realization only. So the author has used the expression 'seen impermanent', instead of rejected or abandoned. In other words, if one remains unattached to all the world's concentrating on what is given by the spiritual master, spiritual illumination will arise in the consciousness of the self.

The following illustrative verse refutes the contention that the so called evision is mere emptiness appearing as wonder.

a) When the impermanent evolves sky and others are rejected, will not the Primal one, the unique, who is without gunas, without impurity in the form of eternal bliss and transcending the individual self come as boundless wonder and inseparable illumination ?

Meaning of the verse :

He is not known, as the impure world, in the form of any one of the three gunas, bright, aggressive and chaotic ; nor as is the mixed world, in the form of the effects of Anava and Karma, nor as is the pure world, in the form of transitory bliss. He appears superior to the individual self, which is known according to the phenomenal condition in association with the three forms of the worlds and the selves. He appears at first to be a mere vacuum, when the sky etc are seen to be impermanent and rejected. But afterwards will He not appear as the permanent light of the light (the self of the self) abiding in inseparable union with the potency of the self which transcends the sense conditioned knowledge ?

Sivajnana Munivar in his commentary points out that the bright quality will be determined in any one of three forms brightness, subdued nature or pleasure : the aggressive quality in one of the three forms of restlessness, aggressiveness or pains making and the chaotic quality will be determined by any one of the three modifications, confusion, colourlessness or darkness. The effects of Anava are the seven qualities, infatuation etc, and the effects of the karma (acts) are pleasurable or painful experience. Sky etc. will mean the five elements if the order of creation is taken and the other thirty-one evolves if the order of absorption is taken and so, it means all the 36 evolutes.

The verse tells that spiritual illumination is experienced as something undetermined as it is not experienced by the self previously : here the Primal Being refers to its illumination, the spiritual light.

The next illustrative verse answers the contention, why in the absence of valid reason, should not we take the indeterminable thing as something other than the spiritual illumination.

2 (b) When the objects are objectified as *asat* know what remains rightly as *Sat* only. Thou art not *Sat*, who hast objectified *asat*. As thou unitest with the reality as *Its* belonging, the false will leave and go.

Meaning :

Three entities are posited in the general section, pati, pasu and pasa, which are shown as Sat, Sadasat and Asat respectively subsequently. When things which are the objects of the pointed knowledge are objectified as asat, you can with reason conclude what remains as Sat (or reality) only. You, who have been objectifying the things belonging to the class asat cannot be Sat, for you have been asat by identifying with asat. Since after realizing Sat in this way you unite with the reality which is sat as a dependant, the false general (phenomenal) nature of yourself will leave you and you will become Sat. Hence you are not even asat.

The last sentence is obtained by implication from what has been expressed already.

So since you leave asat by uniting with Sat, you are *Sadasat* : This is to be taken as the conclusion of the verse. This conclusion of the verse cannot be considered repetition of the idea of vii 3B, since the same idea is established in a different way in order that it may be retained everywhere.

The following illustrative verse relates how to reject asat after knowing it as asat, how to unite with the reality (Sat) as its dependant and how by such union the phenomenal nature of the self leaves it once for all. Thus it strengthens the proposition of this topic.

2 (c) When the self sees, what it sees, as asat and thus rejects it, and then searches for sat in its own consciousness and realises the Lord, then it rids itself of the defect of the old, even as poison is removed by the effective meditation of garuda (kite).

Exposition : When the self rejects the impermanent world by examining the constituents of it, discovers the Primal Being and meditates on—It, as instructed by the Spiritual master, it rids of its old impurity and becomes pure Sat itself. This is like a man who overcomes the effect of poison by the power of divine garuda, who appears in the glorious garuda-meditation.

Sivajnana Munivar explains realizing the Lord in its own consciousness in the following words : The spiritual master thinks within himself Sivoyam (This is Siva), and tells the disciple Sivattvamasi

(thou art Siva) and instructs the disciple to meditate on the import of the grand expression of Siddhanta in the form Sivoham (I am Siva) and adds the following explanation.

Explanatory Note : We shall express what is meant by Garuda meditation here. Garuda the royal bird is of three kinds Adi bhaudika, Adi daivika and the Adiyatmika. In this way the three kinds are to be supposed among each and every thing. The bird that we see in the world is Adibhautika garuda. The spell which is meditated on in the mind of the Mantrika instead of the bird is — the Adi daivika garuda ; the potency of Siva that rewards such meditation as being localised and in the spell is called adi atmika garuda. Of the three, the garuda meant here is the spell in the mind of the mantrika as the presiding deity of the bird. To meditate on it is to become inseparable from it by the daily practice of the spell. If one looks at the patient who has been bitten by a snake, that look will surely remove the poison from the patient and cure him of the poison. Hence this meditation is an existent one. To speak of it as mythical is derogatory. It is said in the upagama sarvagnanottara that there are spells corresponding to all beings whether immovable or movable on the earth and the self which can assume the nature of the thing in contact with it like a crystal will come to possess the nature of the spell whichever was practised.

THIRD TOPIC

Introduction :

The foregoing two topics have instructed the disciple to realize the permanent spiritual illumination by seeing the impermanent principles of bondage as such, and then to see the Primal Being in his own consciousness with that spiritual illumination. These two means will enable the disciple to attain the bliss of the Primal Being.

Here the disciple is likely to think that there is no more means to be adopted for the attainment of release. The third topic clears this doubt and points to the means of cleansing the self by practising the pronunciation of the letters-five.

Proposition with the statement of reason :—

Now in this place repeat the letters-five after the manner prescribed :

for, although for these selves the spiritual knowledge has shone forth yet they tend towards the former ignorance like a caterpillar which has fed on neem.

Exposition :

Though, when *pasa* is removed, spiritual knowledge and divine reality are revealed, some thing is still needed for cleansing the self.

The purpose of mentioning *now* has been explained as to indicate the relevance. The meaning of the 'phrase in this place' is when the self is rid of the bondage and it has seen the sight of the divine reality in its own consciousness with the eye of spiritual illumination. Letters-five here indicates the form which is contemplated on in the state of release. The prescription is indicated in the expression, 'abandon the bondage and see the Primal Being in your consciousness with the eye of spiritual illumination, of the aphorism itself. In Siddhanta the order of repetition should conform to the order of *conduct*. So the author has indicated the prescription in the order of conduct itself. This should be appreciated by all intelligent men. The various forms of the five syllables and their uses have been elaborated in Unmai vilakkam, Sivaprakasam, Tiruvrut payan, Kodi-p-pattu (the poem of banner), Nencu vidu tudu etc. There are three ways of repeating a spell: they are Manatam (mental), mandam and vacakam (so that the letters may be distinctly heard by the person who repeats alone and those who are beside). Of these this is called pure mental (suddha manatam) and is counted by knowledge only. This is indicated in the aphorism by the term *ponder* instead of repeat. The term used in Sanskrit Sutra is 'meditate' (Dhyani).

The statement of reason removes the objection that it is in excess and repetitive. The meaning of the statement of reason is as follows. The caterpillar which usually feeds on neem leaves, when once even happens to taste sugarcane will feel inclined by force of habit to taste the neem. So also an aspirant who has experienced the sight of Siva by following all the means prescribed will feel inclined to taste the world by force of habit. In order to remove the effects of the force of habit it is prescribed at this place that the letters-five in the form prescribed should be pondered over.

So the means prescribed before is to get the spiritual illumination shine and realise the sight of the Primal, Being and the pondering

over the letters-five here is to put an end to the force of habit. So it cannot be said to be in excess and is repetitive.

So the prescription of the pondering over the letters-five of release is only for such selves as have seen the sight of Siva as said above.

If this means is to break the force of habit how are we to realise the object? This question is answered by the following illustrative verse :

3. (a) Knowing the self to be the dependant on Siva from the manner of pronunciation, and adopting the heart of the body as the place of worship, the navel as the place of offering oblation and the midpoint of eyebrows as the place of meditation if worship is performed to god with the letters-five, then it becomes a dependant on Primal Being.

Expository Notes :

Here meditation at the midpoint of the forehead and homam at navel are accessories to the main act of worship in the locality of heart.

This verse describes the meditation of the letters-five of release as a fulfilment of the external ritual of worship and as a way of confirming the experience of the self's union with the Absolute reality.

In the internal worship corresponding to the external form of worship the form of god is to be imagined to be made of the five syllables as given in unmai vilakkam and the following qualities should be considered as the eight flowers. The qualities are i. Non-injury to life, ii. restraint of the senses iii. patience iv. grace, v. knowledge, vi. truth, vii. penance and viii. love.

While raising the fire of sacrifice at the navel, the spell of five-letters should be used. The ghee is the nectar drawn from the seat of bindu (the midpoint of forehead) by means wooden spoons of Sushumna and the nerve passing through the left nostril (the container and the cover respectively). The meditation should take the form of, 'He is I,' giving to the three syllables Siva and ya the meanings Tat, asi and tvam (that art thou) respectively. Dependance of the self on Siva is expressed by the expression Sesha Seshi bhavam in Sanskrit That which remains for the sake of another only, losing its independence

is said to be the seshā of another. Another is said to be the seshi. Bhavam = nature.

How to become the servant (or bond man) will be obtained from the next aphorism.

Even when one obtains the steadiness by knowing the Primal Being in one's consciousness by spiritual illumination which is pervasive, the steadiness might be broken by the effects of the past memory of the impermanent world. The above practice directs one's consciousness force by pondering over the letters-five in the above manner preserves the steadiness and removes completely the effects of the past memory.

The following verse impresses with illustrations how god cannot be realized unless the letters-five are pondered over, how He appears when such pondering is undertaken and how the self becomes the dependant on the primal Being after its appearance.

3 (b). If the self sees Siva in its own consciousness as one sees Rahu in the moon and the sun, he will appear as the enlightener, just as fire appears when wooden sticks are rubbed together. The self, like iron in the fire, becomes His servant. So recite the letters-five.

Meaning of the verse :

Of the nine planets, Rahu and Ketu are not seen as the others are, but only in the moon and sun at the time of eclipse. Similarly, of the three entities, pati, the Lord, does not, like pasu and pasa which are objectified by the conceptions of 'I know' and 'I know not' respectively, appear to the knowledge of the self in any way. But when having set Him in its lotus heart in meditation of the letters-five, the self sees Him, He appears there even as fire in the wood when the friction stick is removed. He is seen as the light of the light (self of the self) or the inner principle of the self's consciousness. Then the self loses its independence and becomes the servant of god, just as iron in the fire loses its hardness as well as its rust and becomes like fire. Hence the recitation of letters-five is necessary. Rahu and ketu are only shadows of the earth, hence the author has used the name of Rahu alone to include ketu as well.

The following verse describes the constituents of the lotus of the heart. The objection how god who transcends all the evolutes is to be

worshipped in the heart is removed by this description. The macrocosm is equivalent to the microcosm and so whatever is found in grossform in the former is found in a subtleform in the latter. Thus this verse strengthens the above worship.

3 (c) The Stalk of the lotus-heart is earth and others. The petals are vidya. The evolutes Isvara and sadasiva are the stamens which are kalas in number. Sakti is ovary. Therein is Siva or Nada. On it worship feet of Siva.

Meaning :

If the nature of the lotus-heart is examined, the twenty four Atma Tattvas from earth onwards form its stalk. The seven vidya tattvas and the evolute Suddha Vidya form the eight petals. The two tattvas Isvara and Sadasiva are the sixty four stamens. The Sakti Tattva is the ovary. The Siva tattva forms the fifty-one seeds which are found on the ovary. In this lotus-heart feet of Siva abide. Meditate on this and worship with letters-five.

Kala indicates the number sixty-four, for kalas are usually numbered as 64 in number.

The lotus should be imagined to rise from navel with a stalk of length equal to the thickness of eight fingers.

The lotus is to be meditated on as the seat. This lotus is different from the worldly one which has its origin from the stalk. This divine lotus has, it is to be noted, its origin from the seeds onwards.

Different meanings are ascribed to the corresponding Tamil verse to suit the Agama followed.

CHAPTER ON FRUIT

Tenth aphorism

If the self becomes one with the Lord, even as the Lord is (one) with the self and abides in the Lord's service, powerful karma with mala and maya passes away—is the Tenth aphorism.

Intention :

The intention of this aphorism is to instruct regarding the removal of bondage.

Commentary :

Introduction : As by the three aphorisms of the last chapter the nature of the aspirants the nature of and attainments of the aspiration and how to aspire are respectively dealt with and it is taken to deal with the fruit of such aspiration in this chapter, this chapter is named the chapter on fruit.

The fruit is two-fold, the removal of bondage and the attainment of Siva or bliss. So with a view to deal with the removal of bondage this first aphorism of this chapter tells what is to be done while pondering over the letters-five and forms a supplement to such a topic.

After instruction is given on aspiration, there is the natural desire to know about its fruit ; from this the relevance of chapter is obtained. This aphorism deals with the profit of the self (Atma labham) after dealing with the purification of the self in the last aphorism. From this conventional order the relevance of aphorism is obtained. When it was ordered to ponder over the letters-five as prescribed, unless it is also given the manner of abiding, there will be the question why all persons who ponder over letters-five as prescribed are not releaved of the vestiges of mala. Hence by the removal of this objection we have the relevance of topic as well.

It may be argued that since the fruit was indicated in the eighth aphorism, by the expression, ' the self leaving the savage senses reaches the feet of Hara in inseparable union ', there will be no desire to know it here. There the fruit is indicated in general terms so that the aspirant may put forth effort to follow the aspiration. Here it is given in more detail. Hence to know the same thing in more detail desire is certain to arise. Similar questions and answers may be inferred likewise.

Paraphrase :

The Lord, who was seen with the eye of grace in the consciousness of the self, though as an entity is different from the self, was one with the self in the state of bondage so that he could not be seen different from it. Similarly if the self identifies and becomes one with the Lord and abides in His service, the vestiges of the powerful karma

along with mala and maya which will affect the self, even after the principles themselves were abandoned like a mirage, will disappear even without a trace of them.

To avoid various questions that may be asked with respect to the manner of becoming one with the Lord, the author has used the illustration of oneness of the Lord with the self in the state of bondage. The following illustrations might be put forward by the various religionists as illustrations for the oneness of the self with the Lord.

When the pot is destroyed the sky within the pot becomes one with the sky outside, when the nacre appears as silver, there is oneness by erroneous perception ; when we say that the earth itself is the pot, the oneness is got between the two things by the transformation of one thing into another. When we consider a white lotus, the whiteness and the lotus are one in being the quality and the qualified. In the case of red hot iron, fire and iron become one because of their blending. When water and milk are mixed, they become one, because of the inseparable mixture, which relation may be called contact. As the magician becomes garuda the oneness is got by meditation. When red hot iron is immersed in water, water becomes iron because of absorption of one into the other. When the devil and the possessed become one, the oneness is obtained by possession.

When the wood hides fire, they are one because one of them is invisible. So the cause for oneness may be remaining unmanifested. Oneness may also be obtained by the loss of potency as in the case of a lighted lamp in the presence of the sun. It may also take the following forms. Is the oneness to be attained by mere experience of pleasure as in the case of a lover and the beloved. Is it to be obtained as in the case of friends by the greater degree of friendship or is it to be attained by similarly as in the case of a domestic cow and a forest cow called gavaya. Thus according to the opinion of the various religionists, different questions may be asked. In order to avoid this variety of objection the author has cited the example of the oneness that existed between the Lord and the self in the state of fetter or bondage.

In this aphorism, ' the self becoming one with the Lord as He was one with the self ' is the first topic and ' if it abides in Him as His servant the powerful karma with mala and maya is removed is the second topic. Thus this aphorism issues into two topics.

FIRST TOPIC

Injunction with the statement of reason :

Here the self is instructed to be one with the Lord, Paramesvara as He was one with the self (in the fettered state) for, it is by such identification, that the self cleanses away the self conceit that cause the conceptions of I and *mine*, and reaches the Sacred feet.

Commentary :—

The aim in the last topic was to remove the traces of fetters that adhere to the self even after the fetters were removed as per instruction. The instruction was that the letters-five are to be pondered over so as to yield the meaning of the grand expression of a siddhanta. Here a doubt may arise whether no other precaution is to be observed. This doubt is removed by enlightening the Siddhanta (the final conclusion). The siddhanta is contained in the injunction of the topic that while pondering over the letters-five of release, the self is to abide in *oneness with the Lord*.

Sivagnana Munivar explains in his Padiyam the meaning of 'to be in oneness' (Ekan aki nirral) by quoting the ll. 61-63 of 'Sankalpa Nirakaranam', refutation of the concept of Saiva-vadin in the following manner. 'If one settles in clarity with regard to the sacred grace, which is the summum bonum (the chief good) of Siddhanta, it is to be said in the words of Manikka Vacakar, 'identifying oneself by losing one's egoism in atomic degrees and becoming one with God'. This is said in that work towards the end as the highest conclusion. 'Being one with the Lord' is 'to abide in oneness with the Lord', inferring the relation in the letters-five or release.

The statement of reason is given to establish the injunction that in addition to pondering over the letters-five it is necessary to abide oneself in oneness with the supreme.

The meaning of the statement of reason is given as follows : unless the self abides in oneness with the Lord, the self's separateness caused by the root impurity, Anava, which results in the delusive knowledge which has the three elements, the seer, the seen and the seeing, will not be erased ; and unless the three principles are erased, the supreme bliss of Siva will not be experienced by the self.

In the expression, I and mine, 'I' indicates the seer, and 'mine' indicates the inseparable 'seeing', and its separable object 'the seen'. *Seeing* is the quality of the self expressed as its action. Note that to be free from the trace of mala, the impurity, and to enjoy bliss of Siva, the only means is to abide in oneness with Siva. Self conceit indicates the trace of Anava : the figure used is metonymy.

The following illustrative verse shows how the knowledge that analyses the elements of consciousness into the subject, object and the process of knowledge is delusive and thereby strengthens the statement of reason :

1 (a). To those that think in terms of I and He, there is the self-consciousness and so the Lord does not appear as Himself but the self. Those who efface themselves and see only Himself, the Lord places under His feet thus hiding them, and appears Himself.

Meaning :

Those that differentiate the knower and the known as I and He, have the predominance of self consciousness, even as those who conceive themselves to be the Primal Being. Hence the Supreme who is the Self of the self is absent for them : but those that submit themselves to the pervasion of the Supreme, and see only His existence, experience the Bliss of the Supreme by that identification and the Supreme alone is existent for them.

Human eye can see things only in light. If the eye is to differentiate the function of the two as this is eye and that is light, eye is the only thing really perceived as the potency of seeing alone is predominant and the existence of the light is seen only delusively not really ; objectively and not subjectively. Similarly the existence of God, the Self of the self, can be perceived by clear perception as He alone ; not in the differential perception, nor in the peception of 'I' alone.

The same idea is expressed by Umapati in st. 11 of Vina venpa as follows :

Those that negate the three elements of seeing in their perception do not see the *Good* release : but even those that persist in seeing the elements, the seen, that which makes one see and seeing, have not yet reached the level in which my spiritual teacher, Sambanda, enables one to reach the state of release.

The same author in Sivaprakasam, st. 8 of the special section, says : The light of eye blends with the light of the lamp, the intention is not one :

Of the two perceptions, the perception of the eye and the perception of the light of the lamp, if one asks what is wrong perception and what is the correct one, as the eye's light differs according to the colour of the light which enlightens it, to see it as the same is wrong perception, but to see the different lights as they are is the correct one.

The eye sees the lamp and the lamp's light shows the object to the eye. So there is the blending of light with the light of the eye.

Also, the selves cannot see objectively one another. But they can imagine how the other selves know their objects etc., from their own actions. Hence the following scriptural statements.

Sivaprakasam — Special 22 says : If the supreme is known by its grace, the self can see itself. The same : special 28 says : If in that state the self abides in it so that no evolutes can be alive, it will realize its own pervasiveness. Pattinattar in three gems of Tiruvīdaimarudur, 12 says : I knew myself and others : Those who do not see you cannot realize themselves. Note that in other places also similar things are expressed.

SECOND TOPIC

In the first topic, it is instructed to transcend the differentiation of the three elements of knowledge (the knower, knowledge and the known) while pondering over the letters-five in order to erase the traces of the root impurity. Then the question arises whether the three potencies, cognitive, affective and conative of the self are destroyed in that state or not. If the answer is in the affirmative, it is contrary to Siddhanda where the qualities themselves are entities and so the entities will not be eternal. If the answer is negative, then the oneness of the self with the Supreme cannot be realised. This question is properly answered here by giving the remedy to remove the traces of maya and karma.

Injunction with the statement of Reason :

Now, the disciple is instructed to abide unfailingly in the service of the Lord, for, if the self does nothing except by His grace, ignorance and karma cannot enter.

Commentary :

Unfailingly means without swerving. The author himself explains what is meant by the Lord's service in the statement of reason. It is remaining without doing anything except by the Lord's grace.

It is necessary for the self to abide unfailingly in service of god, for if the self thus does nothing as of himself but all by His grace, delusive knowledge which is the effect of maya and karma cannot arise to prevent the self's union with god.

As the question of the removal of Anava has already been discussed in the previous topic, Ignorance, Ajnana, mentioned here means the delusive knowledge, the effect of Maya, not of Anava.

Karma here indicates only the traces of agamya, the acts that are done while, experiencing the part of the past action, prarabdha that has come to fruition, the fruits of which are to be experienced in future. Of the three kinds of karma, sancita (the accumulated one) is destroyed at the time of initiation and the prarabdha is to be experienced through the body with which one is born. Hence by the process of elimination agamya alone is to be taken as indicated by the term, valvinai (or karma).

The following verse answers the question how this means will enable the released but still embodied (Jivan mukta) to put an end to the experience of karma. All embodied persons will necessarily experience the fruit of prarabdha, which invariably brings in (or implies) agamya.

2 (a). Senses are not we, nor are they in our control ; organs are not we, we are dependent on Hara. Then for those in such service of the Lord, in whatever body they may be, works do not exist, and previous works also cease in the presence of the giver.

Meaning :

The sense - organs which are the means of experiencing prarabdha and for laying up agamya are products of maya.: They are not ourselves. The external objects and internal organs which are necessary for the functioning of the senses are also products of maya and they too are not ourselves. And their functioning is in dependence on God, not on us. We also, who in union with sense-

organs etc., experience prarabdha and lay up agamyā are incapable of knowledge, unless God, makes us know, and of action unless He makes us act. So we are not self-dependant but dependant on God.

If thus knowing the nature of Pasa and the self to be such, the aspirants see that all they do they do by the action of His grace, they are in dependence on god, whatever deeds they do in this state, do not fetter them. And Prarabdha, which brings with it agamyā, in the presence of god, who attaches it to the selves, passes away as an experience of the body, not affecting the consciousness of the self.

The next verse shows that divine justice is not contravened by this difference in treatment of the selves as the difference is due not to any partiality in god but due to the difference in the selves concerned :

2 (b). It is the duty of a master to protect those who depend on him. So though the Lord protects those who depend on Him, there is no partiality in Him. He makes His servants who depend on Him one with Himself ; and to others He gives their works. Likewise He gives the previous works which come in a subtle way to be experienced.

The difference in treatment is due to the discriminate treatment that can be meted out only by chiefs. Here god treats His servants like Himself protecting them from being affected by Agamyā. Even in making selves experience the Prarabdha this difference is seen, viz ; in the case of the servants it affects only their bodies and in others it invariably brings agamyā which comes in future births.

Previous works — means the Prarabdha. Justification of the last line of the previous stanza is given here in the last line of this verse.

Sivagamas state in the places concerned that Prarabdha affects even realised men. To say that it will only affect the bodies of the realized selves is in violation with the dictates of the Sivagamas. When Prarabdha affects, it invariably brings in Agamyā and the consequent chain of birth and death.

This contention is answered by the following verse :

2 (c). Like the lingering odour of *as-a-foetida* of the container, previous works and maya may be stirred up for the spiritually en-

lightened. But the future consequences of works and maya do not continue, for, being one with the reality, the self adheres to its Axle by knowing It. Axle — main support that does not allow to deviate.

Paraphrase :

Like the lingering odour of Asafoetida of a pot, desire may arise through force of habit in those who know and serve god. Though Prarabdha and the products of maya will arise like the faint odour, yet agamyā, the consequence of Prarabdha does not get a firm hold as a seed made dry in sun's heat for the future but perishes with the products of maya. The self looks to the Lord, its axle, who does not allow it to deviate, for it has become one with the Absolute Reality.

The Agamas refer to this when they speak that Prarabdha affects even realised selves. The enlightenment of abiding in the Lord's service drives away the consequences even as light drives away darkness.

The following verse illustrates how the realised selves maintain their oneness with the reality even when they are affected by the force of habit.

2 (d). Like the great ascetics whom fire cannot burn, like the horseman who is trained to ride a horse with various swift movements, the spiritually enlightened who meditate on the feet of Hara, though they perceive by senses will not on that account lose what they have won.

Paraphrase :

Just as those, who through ascetic practices have won the power not be burned by fire, do not lose their power though they even lie down in fire ; just as those who have studied horsemanship know how to ride swift horse without falling down, so it is with those who know themselves to be masters of the evolutes and have practised to meditate on the feet of the Lord, their axle, through abiding in His service. They do not lose their power and become entangled in fetters even though they experience the five kinds of sensation because of the occurrence of Prarabdha and the products of maya.

The following illustrative verse answers the contention how the self which is sadasat because of its nature of assuming the quality of

the thing it contacts can remain without losing its power even when it contacts the world, the *asat*.

2 (e). If the enlightened *sadasat* sees the Reality by its grace, there is no attachment to *pasa*. So they still reach Sat without nearing *asat*, which will not function as darkness in the presence of blazing light.

Paraphrase :

If the enlightened who knows his nature as *sadasat*, abides in the service of the Lord by remaining without doing anything except with His grace, he has no attachment to the world. So those who propose to reach god will not approach *asat*, the world, which cannot function in the presence of Sat, even as darkness cannot function in the presence of bright sun's light.

From the 9th verse of Tiruvarutpayan of Umapati, which says 'Even though the one is predominant, if the self does not attract light, it may be concluded that darkness cannot be removed at any-time', it is known that it is not natural for the self to be *asat* by associating with it.

From the five illustrative verses of this topic, in order to strengthen the statement of reason, that *maya* and *karma* will not enter, the following are obtained respectively :

(1). To those that abide in the service of the Lord, the experience of *Prarabdha* will pass away affecting the body only and so there will not be *karma* for any future birth. (2). That is obtained by the rule that the result of an act depends upon the nature of the attitude of the doer, (3) If anything happens otherwise, it will affect only the body and the consequent *Agamya* perishes by enlightenment, (4) That enlightenment does not deviate by the force of habit and (5) the reason for the non-deviation is given. Thus by abiding in the service of the Lord *maya* and *karma* are ruled out. From the first topic the removal of *Anava* is obtained. So there is no need for the third topic to establish the content of the third line which speaks of the removal of *pasa*, *mala*, *maya* and with them the powerful *karma*. But the doubt etc. with regard to their absence will be obtained in the first topic of the 12th Sutra which speaks of the removal of the three *malas* of a *Jivan mukta*.

ELEVENTH APHORISM

Like the self that enables the seeing eye to see, the Lord sees and makes the self see. So in unforgetting love the self reaches the feet of Hara — is the aphorism.

Intention :

This aphorism intends to tell the way in which the sacred feet are obtained.

Exposition :—

Attainment of the self is two-fold. The first part is the removal of fetters which was dealt with in the tenth aphorism. The second part is the attainment of Siva and it is dealt with here in the eleventh aphorism. Besides this, it also does two other things. In the last aphorism, the aspirant was instructed to abide unfailingly in the service of the Lord. The explanation of the service of the Lord was in keeping with the content of st. 64 of Tiru-k-kkalirru-p--padiyar which says : Siva is the doer and there is no other doer ; my knowledge is Siva's knowledge and my doings are his. Thus to disown these (is the means).

Here no objects of the self's three fold potency, the cognitive, affective and conative, are mentioned. If they do not objectify anything, there is the objection that what is said as means in Siddhanta is mere vacuum like the * *alaya vignana* mentioned by the Buddhists. This objection is removed here and the objection mentioned while expressing the second part of the self's attainment. With a view to establish its cause, the last aphorism spoke of the oneness with the Lord. But the relation involved in it was not mentioned there. That relation is shown here in this aphorism. In the removal of fetters which was dealt with in the last aphorism, the removal of the traces of prarabdha was not obtained : that is obtained here by the process, ' Is it necessary to mention '. This expanded meaning is the content implied of the intention of the eleventh aphorism, mentioned by the author.

* *Alaya vignana* of the Buddhists is consciousness devoid of content. The Siddhanta does not accept the view that in freed state there is no object for self's thought, desire and action, in which case the freed state would be a state of non-existence.

From the exposition it will be observed that by the removal of objection the relevance of the topic is obtained and by the fulfilment of conventional order the relevance of chapter is obtained. The mention of relation and the answer to the question how *prarabdha* is removed are obtained by satisfying the natural desire : by this, the relevance of Aphorism is obtained.

The following objection may suggest itself to some readers. For those who are in oneness with the Lord and who abide in the Lord's service no other effort is necessary. Also, as the removal of darkness and the coming in of the illumination take place simultaneously, the removal of fetters and the attainment of Siva take place simultaneously. So it is unnecessary to speak of them separately. It is because of this reason, in the Sanskrit tenth sutra these two things are dealt with together by the addition of the expression, ' *Svanu bhuti man bhavati* '. So the separate formulation of the eleventh aphorism may be objected to. But it must be understood that this objection is due to ignorance of true facts *Svanu bhutiman bhavati* means — He has his experience.

To be in oneness with the Lord and to abide in Lord's service belong to the fourth state which ensures oneness with the grace alone (Turiya Arul nilai). Here there is the removal of impurity and there will only be the manifestation of the light of the Bliss. But the blissful state of manifestation of Sivatva happens only in the fifth and last state which is known as Turiyatita. So in order to get the manifestation of Bliss, it is evident that something more has to be performed. In the removal of impurity there will be simultaneous happening of the manifestation of Lord's grace, even as the coming in of the light happens simultaneously with the absence of darkness. But the manifestation of Bliss will not happen. There is difference between the manifestation of grace and that of bliss. The sanskrit version introduces *Svanubhati* in the tenth Sutra only to remind the disciple that release consists of two elements, the removal of impurity and the attainment of Siva. But it speaks of all things concerning the attainment of Siva (for bliss) in the eleventh Sutra alone. The purification of the self which was begun in the ninth aphorism ends in the tenth aphorism. So also, the experience of Bliss which was begun in the tenth aphorism is concluded in the eleventh. It is known clearly by the use of the expression, ' The self reaches the feet of Hara,' which is the exact meaning of the Sanskrit expression ' *Svanubhutiman bhavati* '. This is in no way contradictory to the intention.

Those that do not know this will speak of the state of atita along with the state of turiya in the tenth aphorism itself and classify the eleventh like the twelfth aphorism as giving the nature of the state of Jivan mukti. This is not correct. The author Meykandar himself has given the intention of the eleventh aphorism as giving the way in which the sacred feet are attained. Svanubhuti man bhavati of the Sanskrit tenth Sutra should be attached to the end of the eleventh Sutra while interpreting the sutra. The expression should be added after 'make devotion'. That swanubhuti will be attained only after making devotion.

Paraphrase of the aphorism :

As the eye has the nature to see as it is caused to see, the self in union with the eye causes it to see and itself sees. Similarly, god in union with the self causes it to know and He Himself knows. When the self knows this help rendered by god, being in union with it in advaita relation, it has the unforgetting love, which enables it to attain the experience of divine bliss, the sacred feet of god.

When a thing is seen the eye and the self are both active at the same time and it is difficult to separate the seeing of the eye and the perceiving of the self. They are blended together in inseparableness. In the same manner when a thing is objectified the action of the self and the help rendered by the Absolute are blended together inseparably and we cannot say if the thing was known to the self or to the Absolute behind it. This help is being rendered of the Absolute from eternity both in the state of bondage and in the state of release. The self which has been in oneness with the Absolute abiding in Its service without doing anything unless moved by the grace of the Absolute, cognizes this eternal help rendered which gives rise to the undying love for the Absolute. The same love manifests itself as eternal bliss which is experienced by the self in the state of release. Thus the objection raised is removed and the object for the cognitive, emotive and conative aspects of the potency of the released self is expressed. From the expression that the supreme sees after making it to see it is easy to recognize that such a self whose action is nothing but the action of god remains unaffected by its praradbha. This is the state of atita where the self experiences the bliss of the absolute.

When Sivaprakasam says, 'arivu oli' (=like the cognition of the self) and the light (of the eye) the same meaning is to be attributed to the expression (which is pithy.).

Even as fire does its function only in having its station in a particular thing, so god will do His function only taking His station in the self.

Since the aphorism begins with the comparison 'like the self which makes the seeing eye to see', the relation between the self and the eye is obtained as advaita, the same relation is to be understood even in the expression of the Xth aphorism, which is as follows :

Even as the Lord is one with the self, when the self becomes etc.

The help rendered by the Absolute to the self is classified as the showing help and the seeing help. The showing help has been dealt with in the fifth Aphorism and its function is to enable the self to know the object. In the eleventh Aphorism the intention of the author is to enlighten on the seeing help, whose function is to make the self experience the object, to have ingress in it, identifying with it, being ignorant of all other things, including the subject and its action for the nonce.

The showing help is also mentioned in this aphorism so that the subject may be easily understood. See the preposition of the first topic of this aphorism in order to know this truth.

Since the Sanskrit eleventh sutra also adds *ca* (= and) in the expression *Darsayitaca* (shows too), there is no question that it too speaks of *seeing help* :

In this aphorism, Like the self which makes the seeing eye see, the Lord makes the self see and sees—is one topic. In unforgetting love the self reaches the feet of Hara —is another topic. So this aphorism issues into two topics.

TOPIC ONE

Of these, the first topic deals with the nature of advaita by enlightening about the help rendered by god when the self objectifies a thing refuting the schools of *Isvara avikara vadin* and others.

Proposition along the statement of reason :

Here, He too knows their objects ;

for, these selves exist and know nothing of themselves without Him.

In the above expressions, *He* indicates the Primal Being. The force of 'too' is that knowing not only belongs to the selves, as is evident, but also to the Primal Being. The object of the selves in the state of fetters is the world and that in the state of release is Siva, the Bliss. So the Lord knows Himself too for the sake of the selves, having His locus in the selves themselves.

The statement of reason answers the contention that in the case of the analogy of the eye, the eye is insentient whereas the self is sentient, and supplies the missing valid source for the seeing help of the Lord.

The statement means that even as the eye cannot function without light the selves depend on the Lord not only for their very existence but also for their action. The dependence of the selves on the Lord proves His showing help and their dependence on Him for their experience proves His seeing help. The inseparable togetherness of the Lord is necessary not only for the manifestation of the potencies of the selves but also for their functioning in objectifying their proper entities. The meaning of the statement of reason is as follows : 'Even as the showing help of the Lord is evident from the dependence of the selves for their very existence, His seeing help is evident from their dependence on Him for their objectifying their objects. The existence of the selves means the manifestation of their potencies cognitive, emotive and conative.

The meaning of this statement of reason is expounded in Siddhiyar 11, 7 as follows : 'In all places the selves will neither exist nor know their objects and function without the feet of the Lord : the Lord Himself will rightly enter the selves, will know all their functions and move them by pervading all places. These selves while making their appearance will not appear without Him. For these selves, even like the vowel अ (or A) stands necessary for all letters from A onwards the Lord will stand, So, where can we stand alone without the feet of Hara ?

In this exposition 'In all places' means in both the states of fetters and release. The first part deals with the seeing help of the Lord in enabling the selves to objectify the objects. The part, which deals with the analogy of (A) and says that the selves will not appear without Him, is to deal with the nature of the existence of the selves. This should be understood as above, otherwise the repetition will become redundant. In Sivaprakasam 58, Saint Umapati, also indicated the necessity of light in both the places by the expressions, 'the objects blended with the light of the lamp' and 'the light of the lamp will blend'.

Now, it may be argued that in the state of release there is nothing to be objectified by the self and so to say that in all places the objects of the selves will be known by the Primal Being is incorrect. This argument proceeds from ignorance ; for, it is stated in Unmai Vilakkam 50, that it is the function of the self (in the state of release) to experience the pure Bliss ; also, Sivaprakasam 87 speaks of the state of release in the words, 'the reality which is experienced in inseparable union'. Even in other places similar expression is used. So it is true that in the state of release the self experiences the Bliss which is Siva, and even that is not possible without the help of the Primal Being and it is true that the Primal Being knows that experience of Bliss, having His locus in that self. It is, because with this intention in view, that some Agamas say that even the Primal Being experiences His Bliss Himself. Here the intention behind the wording *experience* is to *know* only.

Sivadvaitins and others do not know this intention and will assert that even the Primal Being will *experience* His Bliss Himself. The meaning of the expression, experience is only 'to know with ingress' (azhundi arital) to know the object identifying with it. We have shown above that nature belongs to the self above and not to the Primal Being. The Primal Being is of the nature of Bliss Itself and He need not experience that Bliss newly. Also all the functions of the Primal Being are performed for the sake of the selves and this was told previously. So it is to be understood that their school is a false pretension.

Now the following objection arises : If god has the showing help alone, He can be said to be free from any change like the attraction of the iron in the mere presence of the magnet. But if god has the

seeing help also, then we suppose that He is together with the self and sees the object. So He should certainly be fettered and subject to change even like the self. To answer this contention, the following illustrative verse is given by the author :—

1 (a). Because the self perceives the objects of the five senses with ingress, identifying itself with them, it does not perceive all at once, but does perceive them one by one. But He, the unchanging one, perceives all things simultaneously.

Meaning of 1 (a) :

It is the nature of the self to perceive its objects by identifying itself with them. So it perceives them one by one and not all at once. The Primal Being is ever the same without variableness and knows the perceptions of all the selves all at once. So He should not be considered to undergo change simply because He knows the objects through the selves.

The following illustrative verse gives the reason why the Primal Being enables the attained to be free from the effects of their prarabdha, while making others suffer from its effects.

This is the cause for relevance given in Padiam. But in the small commentary the same commentator gives another cause for the relevance. The import of this topic is that god knows what the self experiences, which when applied to the freed state involves the logical fallacy of Atmasraya, (dependence on the same self).

1 (b). The Primal Being has the splendour of giving (bliss-ful) experience to those that abide in oneness with Him and conceive as His feet Whatever happens to them. He is one with the self and does not leave it. Will He not-know, being together with the experiencer, what he thinks ?

Meaning :

God is inseparable with the self : He is also known to be experienced as Bliss by the realised selves, when they identify with Him and consider all the happenings of the world as Bliss or the feet of God. So it is established that He knows the intention of the selves when they begin to reap the fruits of their prarabdha.

It follows that the realized selves are free from the consequences of their prarabdha as they think of God and God alone, and not the miseries or pleasures of the world.

As God knows His own Bliss, through the mirror of the self, it cannot be considered to be tarnished by the fallacy of *atmasrya* as what is seen as the image in the mirror is really the object.

Substance of this topic :—

It is well-known that Meykandar in his work develops logically the concept of advaita in the second, fifth and eleventh aphorisms. In the second aphorism advaita was introduced by the expression 'I being one with and other than the selves' with a view to explaining the gross five cosmic functions. Then in the fifth aphorism, by the expression 'objectifying their objects with the grace of their peerless Primal one' the same concept is developed with a view to explain the more subtle cosmic functions of the Lord. This topic further develops the concept of advaita by elucidating the particular aspects of the same five functions and thereby contributes the following ideas : In both the states of fetters and release, the fruits of the works of the selves are known, and owned by the Lord Himself : He distributes them to the selves so as to accord with the nature of their works. This idea is also made clear in the coming topic by the exposition of the author himself.

As it is said that the Lord owns the fruits of the works of even the bound selves, the fruits of works contained by the bodies of the realised selves cannot be said to belong to the selves by any means ; it is they that have sacrificed their body, the self and all that belongs to it as His property and leaving them as such, they remain seeing the eternity alone and not the substances of the world. So it follows that even the Prarabdha, which was not mentioned to be not theirs in the previous topics, will, without any mention, be owned by the Lord and be destroyed. It is because of the fact that the Primal Being will own all the works of even the bound selves, being in inseparable togetherness with them, the following scriptural sayings are heard : Siddhiyar says ' whatever deity ye worship, it is only Siva who has a woman as his better half that will be present in that form ' ¹, and ' He

¹. II 25 ;

will reward with His authority the work which we perform there². The Ammai of Karai-k-kal says : ' only He cognises as cognitive potency ' ³. The Agamas also command those that give and those that take a thing in the world will do so as a sacrifice to Siva ; otherwise it will be wrong on their part.

SECOND TOPIC

In the first topic the nature of pure Advaita which establishes the release in Siddhanta, was expounded, after refuting all the other schools of thought. The second topic fulfils the desire to know how that should be attained by that means and tells the attainment of Siva the Bliss, which remains to be told of the two fruits of the self.

The proposition with the statement of reason :

Now, the self, by the praise resulting from unforgetting devotion, reaches His sacred feet, for, He in inseparable union, causes the fruit to form of what the selves do.

The meaning of the proposition may be written from the part of the Aphorism which it represents.

The three aspects of the potency of self, the cognitive, emotive and conative, will manifest simultaneously and the order may not be important in general. But here the order is to be observed as they act at first ; so the order as mentioned in the aphorism is to be followed.

Praise here means worship or remaining as per His grace. Devotion is love. It manifests even in the final state of oneness with the Absolute. Those that do not know this, attribute it only to the state of Jivan mukti and give their own interpretation.

Without love there will be no experience of bliss. If it be confined to the state of Jivan mukti only, Meykandar will have used the expression of love only in the twelfth Aphorism. So it is not the intention of the author.

The statement of reason answers the contention that in the world it is not observed that one is in love with a thing simply because of its knowledge and that mere love of the object cannot enable one

². II 26 ; (3) Book II ; ³. Tiru andati, 20.

to obtain it. It also gives the intention of first topic of this aphorism, where the author has said that the Lord sees and makes the selves see.'

Its meaning is : The Lord unlike ordinary persons is in advaita relation with all the selves and sees whatever is done by the selves together with the purpose and fulfils the intention of the selves immediately. Hence the proposition.

The illustrative verse of one of this topic explains how the cognitive potency of the selves is made manifest by the Lord. It also answers the objection that may be raised that in case God is in inseparable togetherness with the selves both in their states of bondage and of freedom, He should be perceptible even like the self and the bondage.,

2 (a) Though the sun be there, it is dark except for those with sight. Even so God is invisible to those bound by pasa. From those who know him with love, God removes pasa by His grace. They are like the lotus which the sun causes to bloom.

Meaning -

Though the sun is the same for all, it is the darkness of night to all except those who have sight. Similarly though God is the same everywhere, He is hidden by impurity from all except the freed who have put away impurity. To those who are partially free and have worldly knowledge (pasa Jnana), He will appear as the limited pasa Jnana. To those matured selves that are completely free from the limitations of impurity and are able to see God by His grace, He will show Himself in full splendour even as the sun opens only the mature lotus to its full bloom.

Thus this verse expounds how the self's cognition is manifest in the state of freedom and how it is dependent on the conscious-force of the Primal Being. * 1

The next illustrative verse deals with the God's help with respect to the blossoming of the emotive aspect of the self's potency, thereby

* 1 In the small commentary, Sivajnana munivar uses the comparison of the lotus to represent Jivan muktas who are found in the body. It is only the mature lotus though it is in company with other immature that the sun causes to blossom. It is only for those who, though in body like others, are ready-who with loving devotion know God and never forget Him, that God causes knowledge to blossom, removing the Fetter by gracious revelation of Himself.

bringing out the point that release from fetter is a gradual process from eternity.

2 (b). As the moon dispels darkness, Hara, who in His love dwells with the selves dispels Impurity. Like a magnet that attracts and controls iron, He is unwearied and unchanged.

Meaning :

The waxing moon, day by day, gradually dispels the darkness of the night that clouds the eye. Similarly, God who from eternity is with the self in His great and gracious purpose to make the self one with Himself, dispels the power of impurity in the self step by step according to the readiness of the self, until the process is complete.

Like the magnet which attracts and masters iron, God experiences no weariness in the process of gradually impressing that power of His upon the self while He drives out impurity and of thus drawing the self to Himself and mastering it. Because He does it without weariness, He is not subject to change. Like the magnet, He does it simply by his presence.

By this verse the way in which self's love develops in the state of freedom and its dependence on the love of the Absolute are explained. The love of the self in the state of freedom is its firm attachment to the Supreme.

The next verse removes the objection that may be raised by the opponent with regard to the attachment of the self to the Supreme and tells thereby how the conative aspect of the self's potency functions in the final end or experience.

2 (c). If after perishing, oneness cannot be attained as the self perishes, there is no oneness, without perishing. The impurity perishes and the self reaches the feet of God and becomes His remainder (Sedam) even as a crystal of salt put in water. There is no severance from the feet of the Lord.

Meaning : It is a legitimate question to ask whether the old limited consciousness of the self is destroyed or not, when the self becomes one with the Supreme. In either case oneness cannot be said to be attained for, in the case we answer the limited knowledge perishes as knowledge, the quality itself is the qualified, it is as much as to admit that the self

perishes and there cannot be oneness of the self. Even in the other case oneness cannot be attained. So the only possibility is to admit the perishing of the impurity that causes limitation to the existence of the self. When the impurity perishes the self loses its limited existence even as the crystal of salt had before blending with water. After the crystal is put in water it loses its limited existence and pervades the whole expanse of water.

St. Umapati in Vinavenpa, 6 says : ' If the limited knowledge is destroyed before, there is no person to attain : if that knowledge persists even to a small extent, there is no manifestation of grace '.

The similarity between the crystal of salt put in water and the released self is that they lose their limited existence and become one with the base with which they blend.

Sedam is defined as that thing which exists for the sake of the other, having no independence of its own. The released self does not do anything unless activated by His grace and is in oneness with the Supreme without severance and it knows, loves and experiences the feet of the Lord. So it is Sedam of the Lord. Meykandar, in aphorism 2, topic 4, verse, 1, has said : ' They are His belongings and we are His servants '. Thereby, even pasu and pasa are sedam to the Primal Being : but they cannot be His sedam in particular : so, he has mentioned specially this here. From this we know that in the state of release the self has its conative aspect of its consciousness and is dependent on the conative aspect of the consciousness force of the Supreme called Kriya Sakti.

The following verse expounds the view that, though the self passes through the three conditions, while attaining release, kevala Sakala and Suddha, it is not affected thereby in its own nature.

2 (d). The radiance of the sun rising in cloud is at first obscured, and when the clouds, pass away shines everywhere. So also the radiant knowledge of the self hidden by Impurity first has experience of the world and then having dispelled Impurity it attains the grace (of god).

Meaning :

The sun in the early morning is hidden by the masses of cloud. Then when the cloud is dissipated at one spot, the sun appears there

with restricted light. Later when the cloud is completely driven away by a strong wind, the sun appears like light shining everywhere. Similarly the self in the Kevala state has its consciousness hidden by Impurity from eternity. Then with the sense organs limited knowledge arises and perceives the five sensations. Then after the complete removal of Impurity by the grace of God unlimited knowledge arises and the self attains the sacred feet and is purified.

The purpose of the statements that the self experiences the world and the sacred feet which are not applicable to the thing compared, the radiance of the sun, is to show, that the comparison is a limited one.

The perishing of the Impurity is to lose the power of hiding is to be understood by the thing compared.

TWELFTH APHORISM

He washes away the impurity which prevents his reaching the lifting feet like red lotus, joins the company of the loving devotees and worships as Hara Himself, the habit of the devotees who abound in love setting apart delusion and His shrines — is the aphorism.

Intention : Its intention is to illuminate the way in which the transcendental Lord be seen comprehensible and worshipped.

The self which is freed and has reached the sacred feet in unforgetting love may be in body. While in body, its thought, desire and activity will be possible to objectify the external world. In that case, this aphorism directs the three aspects of the consciousness of

This verse is taken by the same commentator in the small commentary as follows :—

This verse meets the criticism of the Pasanavadins that Anava being related to the self as quality to substance, lasts as long as the self and cannot be removed as though it were something different from it. The argument is in the form of arthapatti (presumption) — an assumption to account for a fact which is otherwise unaccountable. In this case the assumption that the association of Anava with the self is terminated, such termination being the only way of accounting for the self's attainment of Siva. In the interpretation of the verse the subject of perish in the first part is taken to be the self itself instead of its limited knowledge. He also adds the following sentence in the end: As the end is reached after expounding the state of release, the author has stated 'Anavrtti' in the expression 'There is no severance from the feet of the Lord.'

the freed self to objectify God and God alone. Thereby this aphorism enables to see clearly how the Primal Being which transcends thought and speech can be conceived as being thought of and spoken.

This aphorism answers the question how when the freed self is in body and its three aspects of consciousness flow externally, they are to be directed. As this satisfies the natural desire of the student, by this we have the relevance of the topic. This aphorism by the imperative interpretation as in the case of commands refutes those schools of thought that say that a freed self in body need not observe any rule of conduct. By this removal of doubt the relevance of aphorism is obtained. The eleventh aphorism deals with the final experience of Siva and this twelfth one the next, deals with the nature of a Jivan mukta and this is the conventional order. By this conventional order we obtain the relevance of the chapter.

Paraphrase of the Aphorism :

The Jivan-mukta washes away with the water of divine knowledge the dirt of the three impurities whose nature it is to cause him forget God and prevent him attaining His lifting feet which are like the open flower of the red lotus. He joins the company of those who have true knowledge and unforgetting love and puts away the delusive knowledge which is caused by the Impurity. He lives worshipping as God Himself the persons of those with unforgetting love and their sacred emblems and also the temples of Siva.

The subject Jivan-mukta is obtained by the convention of reading the suitable meaning.

By the expression 'washes away the Impurity' we have the external object of cognition ; by the expression, 'joins the company of loving devotees' we have the object of love and by the expression 'worships' we have the object of action. So the fulfilling of natural desire is understood. These three aspects of consciousness together objectify God. So there is no change in the objectification.

Tozhum (worships) in the original is a finite verb of the third person singular even as the term 'Selum' (reaches) of the eighth aphorism, so we know that this deals with the nature of the attained ; it is because of this, this aphorism is placed at the end instead of placing it in the chapter on means of attainment.

Cow's milk which is food for rich people acts also as medicine which enables to nourish the body without being inconvenienced by disease. So also this method of worship not only removes the residual effects of impurity but also make the bliss of Siva grow more and more. So while giving the interpretation of the various parts of this aphorism, the author (Meykandar) has used the imperative mood, as though the natural actions of the Jivan mukta are followed under direction or command.

In this aphorism, 'washes away the impurity etc., is the first topic, joins the company of loving devotees' is another topic, he worships the habit of the devotee and the shrine of 'Siva as Hara Himself' is the third topic. Hence this aphorism issues into three topics.

TOPIC ONE

Proposition and the Statement of Reason :

Now, root out the impurities, Anava, Maya and Kanmya ; for they do not give knowledge but ignorance.

Note under proposition and reasons of topic one

Karma is called Kanmya in relation to its root.

(This means the commentator takes it to mean *Karma*). There are persons who take the text as *Kamya* and means thereby *akamya*, as *akamya* alone is to be removed of the *Karma* of the realized self. For them the first part of the word *a* in *akamya* is omitted and taken the form *kamya*.

The statement of reason is given to meet the criticism that the removal of impurities has already been accomplished since in the tenth aphorism it is said, ' powerful *Karma* together with *Anava* and *Maya*, passes away '.

But even into those who have gained true knowledge and have attained the sacred feet, these impurities enter some how and overpowering true knowledge cause the old delusive knowledge to gain ascendancy. Hence even a Jivan Mukta is enjoined to wash away the impurities with the water of true knowledge.

Here ignorance means delusive knowledge, which is analytical. The following illustrative verse shows the order in which these impurities enter and affect the Jivan mukta and thus strengthens the reason :

1 (a). This Kanmya which affects in the form of good and evil deeds and then this maya, which appears as the evolutes from earth to the maya, and then Anava which causes ignorance, these three come in this order and affect a realised self. As they are not proper to the spiritually enlightened, he is to leave them.

The enlightened who have cleared all the impurities and reached the feet of the Lord, so long as they are with the gross body, have prarabdha attached to that body. This will occasionally affect them in the form of residue even as the container of asafoetida. As there is no experience without the effort for future experience, owing to that principle, there will be desire and aversion. As they become palpable, to those who see only the Absolute, the evolutes from earth to maya become visible. Since they become visible the delusive knowledge will gain the upperhand and will fell one into the continuing of birth and death.

To point out that the three impurities will affect the Jivan mukta in this order, the author has expressed their effects in this order using the demonstrative adjectives to qualify them. These will make the enlightened lose the experience of bliss. So the author has said that these are not proper to the enlightened and has enjoined him to leave them.

As Anava and Karma are qualified by the demonstrative adjectives, maya also may be taken qualified likewise. Good and evil deeds denote by the figure of metonymy desire and aversion.

These will make the realized one lose one's bliss : so it is said that these are not proper to a man of right knowledge. They should be rooted out as and when they show themselves. Otherwise, they will grow hard and prove injurious to one who tries to root them out. So the author has enjoined the man of wisdom to leave (them).

To leave them is to reflect when the delusive knowledge occurs that is due to seeing the limited evolutes and that limited knowledge takes place in viewing the experience of the prarabdha with the knowledge

of I and mine, and with that reflection placing oneself under the protection of grace so that the Bliss of Siva becomes one's experience. It is with this intention that the first verse of the 10th chapter of Tiruvarut Payan says : The enlightened will sleep so that they will hide themselves in the waxing gracious consciousness and Siva's Bliss will be experienced by them ; no speech is there.*

In the statement of reason, all the three impurities are said to cause delusive knowledge ; but the illustrative verse speaks of Anava alone as causing ignorance. This internal disharmony is met by the commentator by saying ' that producing ignorance is artificial to maya and Karma and it is natural to Anava. In order to make this distinction clear, Meykandar has spoken of causing ignorance in general terms in the statement of reason and he has given the same thing in particular terms in the illustrative verse. So there is no disharmony.'

SECOND TOPIC

The first topic has enjoined the enlightened to root out the three impurities. In order to make it a permanent feature, the second topic fulfills the natural desire, by dealing with the subject where the desire of the enlightened should spread and objectify.

PROPOSITION WITH THE STATEMENT OF REASON :

Here let them associate with Siva's devotees : for, others will cause ignorance.

Siva's devotees means those who have attained the sacred feet with unforgetting love. From the proposition it follows that they should avoid the company of others. It is not because that they prefer the society of some to that of others, for they have transcended desire and aversions and in their eyes all living beings are their own children¹. But the justification for their avoiding the company of unenlightened is that such people bring them again into touch with ignorance, as they do not know the reality.

St. Manikkavacakar says, 'As the idea of divinity came into my life and as I thought of the primary Being free from hate, millions of

* This chapter deals with the nature of those attained (Jivan mutas).

¹ St. 7 of Mummani-k-kovai of Tiru-ividaimarudur.

delusive powers began from various directions their beguiling varied play. Men apparently worthy of faith and others came together and urged their atheism till they wearied their tongues. Friends around, like the herds of cattle old, seized me and solicited. The brahmins showed me the law of trusting love and said that way of penance was Supreme. Sectarian disputants shouted and fought that their own schools of thought were the suitable ones. The hurricane of Maya vada roared, dashed and surrounded. The listening mighty snake of materialism exhibited itself in varied colours etc.²'.

This shows how others cause ignorance. The three impurities cause ignorance only when the time is suitable for them. But those who are not enlightened, create the occasion even if it is not there naturally and inject their views. So these unenlightened are more cruel than the impurities and it is wise to avoid the company of these people.

To consider all living beings as Children is to show mercy to them. Thirumular says : ' Let this earth enjoy the great Bliss which I have attained '. His intention is to show mercy to all, not to keep company with all and sundry. Here a doubt arises. It is enough if the Jivan Muktas do not keep company with the non-devotees. How does it follow that they should be in company with the true devotees ? The following illustrative verse removes this doubt.

2 (a). The company of devotees will enable a spiritually enlightened to sever the association of the non-devotees, who make him forget the true spiritual knowledge and fall into the impurities. Such a company enlivens the true spiritual knowledge and make him love the Primal Being with infatuation. Works cannot touch such men of true austerity.

Meaning : Those who do not love God cause the Jivan muktas to lose the spiritual illumination, whereby they hold fast and never forget their *advaita* relation to God and leading them in an evil way cause them fall into the pit of rebirth, which is effected by impurities. In order to sever their old and long connexion with those who do not love god, the Jivan muktas must be great lovers in the company of Siva's devotees. These devotees remove their forgetfulness, assist

² Po ri-t-tiru vakaval 11 - 43-53.

them in True knowledge, lift them from the pit of rebirth and lead them in the righteous path and make them blessed. Thus they become themselves true devotees and hold fast to the advaita relation with God. Then prarabdha, which causes all sorrows cannot affect them¹.

Those who associate with the devotees of Siva and follow them with thought, word and deed, will not think of the world but will always think of Siva, the Bliss. So the prarabdha will not be experienced by them. Since prarabdha has nothing to do with them, the company of non-devotees will be completely wiped out. Unless the association of devotees are cultivated, the long and old company of non-lovers will not cease : so it is necessary that the Jivan mukta should necessarily be in company of the devotees of Siva.

All other aspirations lead them to the world ; but this leads them to bliss. Hence this is called True austerity.

THIRD TOPIC

This topic illuminates further where the action of the attained in the body should spread, what form it will take in them.

Proposition with the Statement of Reason

Hereafter, worship the sacred habit of Siva's devotees, and the shrines of Siva, regarding them as the Supreme Lord :

For in these places He is visible, while in other places He is not.

Meaning : To make the association with Siva's devotees permanent, Jivan muktas must worship the sacred emblems worn by them and the temples of Siva, looking upon them as God Himself, for, though God is everywhere, there He is visible as ghee in curds, whereas in other places He is invisible as ghee in milk.

The nature of the sacred emblems of Siva's devotees can be understood from the description of Tirunavukkarasu in Periyapuranam : they are ² ' He entered the street with gold coloured body

¹ A song by Tirunavukkarasar in the V book on Nallam expresses the idea of this topic. It begins with the words ' Uraitalarndu '. Its translation is : ' Before the loss of power of speech, Hail the Lord of Nallam worship Him and with the worshippers, associate and dissociate with the non-worshippers '.

² Navukkarasar, St. 140, Sambandar St. 270, 271.

smeared with pure white sacred ash and beautified by the garland of sacred beads : his mind was feeling the very feet of the lord, while his mouth was filled with sacred words forming part of the decad ; 'Arasu with endless emblems came forward in the street ; his thought was filled with unbroken love : there were movements in his body : rags were too rich for his thought : his hands grasped the implement that removed thorny shrubs around the temple : eyes were filled with the rain of tears and his body was illuminated with the white ash. The young one of Kauniayar saw him and received him with lifted hands with thought that he was the ideal emblem worshipped in his mind '.

Habit and temple are terms of courtesy usage. They are attractive to the truly wise even as the clothing, ornaments and paste on the body of women who attract lovers. This is clear from the Song of Sendanar, which reads : 'The pure minded praise the sacred ash on the chest as a thing prominently attractive like the red paste on the breast of women with glittering eyes that move like fish. ¹.

The Statement of reason answers the criticism that to particularise the places of worship of soul of wise does not appear to be proper as they should worship the Lord at all places without any distinction. Ninra Tiruttandakam and Srirudram say that God is everywhere and in all things without any distinction. The answer is given already.

The following illustrative verse explains how God is visible in the sacred habit of His devotees.

3 (a). In order that men may know Him, the Lord gives His form to His devotees and they know Him and are in Him ; so He is visible in the lovers that know Him as ghee in curds. But in those who are involved in pasa, He is not present.

Meaning : In order that those in the world may know Him, God, who is beyond human thought and word, gives his devotees His Sacred form, namely, His emblems of ash beads etc. He makes them know Him by meditation through mystic symbol of oneness with Him : and then He pervades with His pervasive presence those who have known Him by that grand expression. Therefore, in

¹ Tiruup-pallandu, 8.

those who have come thus to know Him through His pervasive presence, He is visible as ghee in curds, but in those who are bound in the fetters, He is invisible, as ghee in milk.

The purpose of giving His form to His devotees is to make the knowledge of worshippers grow thereby.

The second illustrative verse is concerned with the criticism that as the fixed inanimate forms, such as the *linga*, have not, like the moving living forms, the devotees, knowledge of God, He is not visible in them except when *mantras* are used.

3 (a). The Lord is one with the fixed form and is different from it, just as the spark of fire is one with and different from the wood. He is there by means of a mantra known to them ; but to ascetics who know Him as one with it, will He not appear as it ?

Meaning : The fire in the wood will be visible as different from it when the friction stick is planted and churned ; Otherwise the spark will be one with the wood.

Likewise, those who do not know that god is one with the sacred emblem, may require a *mantra* to make Him visible there. But to those that know that He is one with the emblem, the true austere ones, He is there always visible.

The advaita relation of God with His creation, that He is one with and different from it, is cited to show that god does manifest in his creations according as the worshipper conceives Him to be. Though this relation is applicable to the moving forms, the devotees also, yet the doubt with regard to the visibility of god cannot be removed except by this means in the case of fixed emblems which are devoid of wisdom. So the author has mentioned this as reason in that case only.

But this reason is equally applicable to both the cases and this can be seen from the following topic.¹

¹ This relation is expressed in Tevaram by the following song : ‘ God, the light in the precious stone is hidden in His creation like the fire in the wood and ghee in the milk. Planting the stick of love, if churned with the rope of wisdom, He will make His presence felt.’

FOURTH TOPIC

In the above three topics the conduct of the Jivan muktas has been expounded. These acts will naturally be found among them ; so these should be mentioned in the form of concession in the indicative mood. Why should these acts be given as commands in the imperative mood, as ' root out ', ' associate ' and ' worship ? ' This question is answered by means of this fourth topic, which is added as a supplementary.¹

The proposition with the statement of reason :—

Now, ' worship in these places ' :

for, as the self which is one with the nerves, sinews etc, *is also other than they ; so also that Supreme Self.*

Expository Notes :

' In these places ' means ' the habits of Siva's devotees and His shrines ' which were mentioned above. The imperative mood of ' worship ' answers the question, while the indicative concessional form is sufficient why should the imperative of command is used ? Worship is used to denote also the related imperatives, ' root out ' and ' associate with the devotees of Siva ', mentioned in the previous topics.

The statement of reason removes the objection that can be raised in the form, ' To enjoin what is obtained already is of no use '.

The meaning of the statement is as follows :

The self is one with the constituents of the body, nerves, bones, sinews etc., but those who carefully examine the question whether the self is really nerves, bones etc ; see that it is not any of them, but is different from them. Similarly, God, the self of the self, is one with all things animate and inanimate by mingling, but He is different from them by His nature. So the worship etc ; which arises when He is seen to be one with all things will not arise when He is known

¹ Though the analysis of the xii aphorism is complete in the first three topics, a fourth is added to emphasize the necessity of worship etc enjoined in the topics.

to be different from them. Therefore it is necessary to cause this worship (etc.) to arise even when He is seen to be different. So it is put as a command, in interpreting the aphorism, 'Worship in these places'.

Hence it follows that of the three injunctions, Declarative, Directive and Preventive and Restrictive, this belongs to the second category, Directive and Preventive. In order to make this idea clear the author has referred to the objects of worship as places in the proposition, 'worship in these places'. 'As the self is other than they, so also that supreme self' is the expression of the author. This implies that in the case when the Lord is conceived as different from the objects, it is necessary that the injunction is made obtainable. In the Tamil version of this aphorism the last word is 'Tozhume' (will certainly worship) : the suffix in it *ē*, being emphatic, points to this meaning.*

The following illustrative verse answers the question why, if God is one with all things, worship should be limited to these two objects, the persons of the devotees and the shrines of Siva : it also emphasises the worship in the emblem of Sivalinga.

4 (a). For the enlightened, He is not other than the world, nor one with it nor both other than and one with the world : but because the relation is non-duality, which includes all these three, all things are His form. Never the less, thou who knowest the truth of non-duality, worship in love.

Commentary :

The truly wise know the relation between God and the sentient and the insentient, not like that of eye and sun, the difference of two naturally exclusive entities, a this and that ; nor like that of body and self, an identity in which there is only a that, nor an inseparable union like that of quality and substance in which there is a 'this' which is 'that', but that it is a relation which embraces all these three non-duality, like the relation of the self's knowledge and the eye's sight. So all things are His form ; but you who have learnt the truth of *advaita* must worship Him there of all places where love grows.

* ¹ So the fourth topic should be considered to be an expansion of the suffix *e* of the Tamil version.

Siddhi XII 4 says : just as milk which is invisible everywhere, shows itself in the udder of a cow, love of god does not grow in places other than the emblems of God in Siva's Temple'. So the worship there alone makes permanent the illumination of 'advaita'. Hence the author has conceded that all things are related to God, but enjoined on the disciple to worship in the places where love grows, calling Him as one knowing the true meaning of advaita. By this the fruit for command is also expressed.

In IX 2, it was said that if the world was seen as fleeting like the colours of crystal and was rejected, divine knowledge appears and the truth of non-duality of God is made known. Why then is worship necessary? The point of the following verse is that worship is necessary to maintain this knowledge because *prarabdha* constitutes a danger to it which can only be removed by worship of saints.

4 (b). *Asat* arises because of karma. Therefore unless karma is removed, knowledge cannot arise. When in order to remove karma the freed selves seek and worship those who have knowledge, knowledge arises. So worship in love.

This insists on the worship of the persons of Siva's devotees.

Meaning : As long as *prarabdha* in the body affects the self, desires and aversion arise thereby; and because of them, all the evolutes from earth to maya, become visible; and through them delusive knowledge arises. Even when these *asats* are rejected as *asat*, they return and dominate the self. Therefore unless *prarabdha*, which is the cause of all this, is completely removed, true knowledge cannot subdue *asat* and triumph. *Prarabdha* passes away when you seek and worship those who have true knowledge and then true knowledge triumphs. Therefore the worship of devotees with love is enjoined.

4 (c). To forget Him who helped to know oneself and made one like Himself is not a sin which can be exonerated (removed). Though made like God, the self remains a servant. So the worship of the supreme is strength.

The above verse answers the question whether this worship may sometimes be omitted, just as sacrifices are, because the particular

fruit is not needed and thereby enjoins the worship of the spiritual teacher.

Meaning :

To the self that lies in darkness, unable to know God, He makes His nature known and thereby transformed the bound self into Siva. If the self thereafter forgets the gracious help of God, it is not a fault which can be forgiven, like the fault of forgetting Him through ignorance before. Although God has made the self like Himself, the self which is a servant with no independence, remains a servant still as the grace of God is indispensable. Therefore the worship of that great one is a source of strength to it.

It should be remembered that God Himself descends as the spiritual Teacher. Refer to Siddhi XI 10, which says, 'Siva is the doer of all the five cosmic functions, whereas the self has got right to Siva's Bliss only.'

These three verses have pointed out that to worship not only the object of worship but the places of worship also are conducive. They also pointed out respectively how to worship wisely the Sivalinga, the devotees of Siva and the Saiva-Spiritual Teacher.

The following verse, the last, tells us to whom this work may be given.

4 (d). O thou Siva, that hast learnt the essence of Vedanta, selves with one and two impurities become Siva and transcend the region of birth by manifestation within and by sight and speech. Those with three impurities attain it through this book taught by enlightened guru.

Meaning :

O scholar of Siddhanta, the essence of the Vedanta, who have become Siva, for those bound by one and two impurities, Vijnanakalas and Pralaya kalas, the cause of birth is removed and they become Siva, through God revealing Himself directly to the former in their

* In the commentary of 4 (a) of this aphorism, the illustrations for the difference and identity are given as eye and sun and the body and the self and are rejected : but from Sivaprakasam, cf. Aphorism II topic, they should be darkness and sky and gold and ornament made of it.

consciousness, and appearing as a divine guru in front to the latter, by sight, touch and word. But for those with three impurities, the sakalas, this is brought about by this scripture, Siva-jnana-bodham, taught by a human, enlightened teacher.

Touch also is included as *sight* and *word* are mentioned.

Introductory verse :

Meykandan has expounded with reason and illustration so that these earthly men may understand to day, the book which was spoken out by Nandi to Sanat-kumara, my father, when he praised and worshipped him naturally.

APPENDIX

THE EDITIONS OF SIVAJNANA BODHAM KNOWN SO FAR—(contd.)

S. No.	Nature of the Commentary with Author's Name	Edited or Printed by	Year
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I. Sivajñāna Pāḍiyam (Perurai) :			
1.	Sivajñāna Pāḍiyam by Sivajanana Yogikā-ful	Vidyānupālana Press, Madras—by Palvaṇṇa Pillai	1921-22 (Dunmāti) Markazhi
2.	Re-edition of the same	Saiva Siddhānta Mahā Samajam, Madras	1936
3.	Re-edition with some corrections	Saiva Siddhānta Works Publishing Society.	1936
4.	The work is being reprinted by the same till now	—	—
5.	Sivajñāna pāḍiya-tiravū by K. Vajravelu Mudaliar, Special officer, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai.	Madras University, Dept. of Philosophy.	1977
<i>The following are the authoritative editions of ciṭṭurai known so far :—</i>			
II. Sivajnana Bodha—ciṭṭurai :			
1.	Sivajnana bodha—ciṭṭurai	Sri-Ja-Sri Arumukha Navaḷar of Jaffna residing at Chidambaram.	1885-86 (Pāṇṭitīva) 1905
2.	Meykanda Shastras—All the fourteen with paraphrases	Kanchi-Nagalinga Mudaliar of Madras	1922-23 (Duntuppi)
3.	Reprint of (1)	—	1916-17 (Nala)
4.	Sivajnana bodha Vacarāṇakara Deepam—with authoritative quotations by Sri Sendilnada Iyer of Jaffna.	Saiva-vidyānupālana Press, Madras	Date Not known
5.	Sivajnana Bodham with Paṇḍi Perumal Virutti	Shanmukha Sundara Mudaliar of Madras.	—

APPENDIX


THE EDITIONS OF SIVAJNANA BODHAM KNOWN SO FAR—(contd.)

S. No.	Nature of the Commentary with Author's Name	Edited or Printed by	Year
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6.	Sivajñāna Bodham with Pandi perumal Virutti	Tiruvavādhuthurai Ādhinam	1950
7.	Cirūrurai Vilakkam by P. Muthaiya Pillai of Tuticorin	—	1918
8.	Cirūrurai Vilakkam by Avvai Duraisami Pillai	Annamalai University	1953
9.	Meykandar and Sivajñana Bodham by K. Subramania Pillai	Saiva Siddhanta Maha Samajam, Madras	1932
10.	Prose rendering of all the 14 Sastras by K. S. Pillai	Thondaimandala S. S. Sabha, Kanchipuram.	1938
11.	Essays of several scholars on the aphorisms	Dharmapuram Ādhinam	1944
12.	Old commentaries of Sivajñana bodham	Tiruvavādhuthurai Ādhinam	1952
13.	Sivajñāna bodha Ārayacci by Maraimalai Adikal	S. S. Works Publishing Society Ltd., Madras.	1958
14.	Saiva-Siddhanta-t-tiravu by K. Vajravelu Mudaliar of Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai.	M. K. University, Madurai.	1980
<i>III. English translations of the work available :</i>			
1.	Translation by J. M. Nallasami Pillai, B.A., B.L.	Somasundara Nayagar, G. Ramasamy Chetty, Madras.	1895
2.	Reprint of the same	Dharmapuram Ādhinam	1945
3.	Translation of the aphorisms, commentary with illustrative verses by Gordon Mathews, M.A., B.Litt., of Madras X'ian College.	OXford University Press, Oxford, London.	1948
4.	Translation of Pandi Perumal Virtti by H. R. Hoisington	B. L. H. Amlon printer, New Haven	1854
5.	Reprint of the above	Dharmapuram Ādhinam	1979
6.	Translation by H. A. Poply	Madras X'ian College, Magazine	1910
7.	Translation by Navamani David Nadar, B.A., B.L.	Printed by Janaanukoola Press, Trinopolopoly.	1927
8.	An outline of Sivajñāna Bodham by S. Sivapada Sundaram Pillai of Jaffna, Sri Lanka.	—	1951

IV. Books on *citturai* and *pēruai* :

When Sivajāṇa Bodham attracted the attention of the public, many editions of it, with various objects in view came into existence. The following may be counted among them :

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Sivajāṇa Bodha vinā viḍai-(catechism) by Virudhanagar
Sivajāṇa Yogikal | Saiva Prakasa Press, Tuticorin | 1920 |
| 2. Sivajāṇa Padiyam by Swaminatha Pandithar (no order or
consistency is perceived) | — | 1906-07 |
| 3. Sivajāṇa Bodha-c-curukkam by Valaiyananda Swamikal | Golden Comapny of Triplicane, Madras | 1928 |
| 4. Karutturai Vilakkam (Glossory of intention) by Alalasundaram
Pillai, Kanchipuram | Rajaratnam Chettiar | Date not
known
1922 |
| 5. Sivajāṇa Bodham with Vedanta dipika by Palaniswami
Swamikal | Star Press, Kumbakonam | 1929 |
| 6. Sivajāṇa Bodha Theliporul Vilakkam by Vadiivel Chettiar of
Chintadripet | M. Shanmuga Sundara Mudaliar | 1930 |
| 7. Sivajāṇa Bodha Urai by Sivagurunatha Pillai, Tuticorin | Saiva Siddhanta Sabai, Tuticorin | 1950 |
| 8. Sivajāṇa Bodha Urai by Saba. Sivaprakasam Pillai | Tillai Tirumurai Kazagam | 1955 |
| 9. Sivajāṇa Bodha Urai by Chidambaram Swamigal | Editor Muktananda Swamigal | 1957 |
| 10. Sivajāṇa Bodha Urai by Chinmayananda Swamigal
(Vedanta Prakasam) | Minerva Printers, Madurai | |
| 11. Sivajāṇa Bodham and the twelve books by Sreenivasa ācaryar | Tiruvavāduturai Ādhinam | 1969, 1972-73 |
| 12. Sivajāṇa Bodham with Teliporul by N. R. Murugavel | Dharmapura Ādhinam | 1977 |
| 13. Pross rendering of Sivajāṇa Bodham in four volumes by T. S.
Meenakshi Sundaram Pillai. | Tiruvavāduturai Ādhinam | 1969, 1972-73 |



INDEX

- Abhava 76, 77, 241
 Abhava vāda 329
 Abrahamana 135, 317
 Acit 290
 Ādi Saiva 58, 59
 Acchuta Kalappalar 20
 Adamas 71
 Adikara 89, 175, 180
 Adharma 135, 194
 Adhi bhautika 153, 216, 369
 Adhi daivika 153, 216, 369
 Adhikaranas 91, 92
 Adhimarga 151, 154
 Adhvas 53, 55
 Adhva suddhi 208
 Adhyatmuka 151, 153, 154, 216, 369
 Adhyasa 260
 Adhyasa vāda 84
 Adīṣṭāna karana 6
 Advaita 2, 135, 136, 138, 141, 315, 400, 403, 305
 Advaitin 67
 Advitiyam 20, 23, 135, 137
 Adventitious 31, 32
 Agamas 37, 39, 40, 43
 Agamic literature 33
 Agent of dissolution 8
 Agavanīya 243
 Āgamiya 152, 155, 347, 379
 Agantuka 256, 257
 Aghora Siva 35
 Aghora hrdaya 182
 Aham 66
 Ahankara 160, 254
 Aikya 317
 Aikya vādin 66, 67, 68, 87, 258, 333
 Ajapa 254
 Ajñāna 266
 Ajiva 74
 Akasa 75
 Akṣapāda 78
 Ālaya vijñāna 73, 261, 381
 Alavai 78
 Anadi siddha 74
 Anekanta vāda 76, 103, 138
 Ānmarham 52
 Ananta Deva 93, 178, 175, 179, 183, 189
 Analogy 78, 96
 Antaratma 307
 Anantesvara 39, 183
 Āpava 7, 9, 16, 24, 69, 115, 147, 165, 186, 248, 249, 257, 266, 342, 351, 363, 397, 398
 Āptahkarapa 251
 Ānma Darsana 64
 Antakamīra 220
 Antaryami 109
 Anuvāda 142
 Aparamukti 342
 Aprakasa 135
 Appar 14, 145, 157
 Appaiya Diksita 90
 Apurva 80, 151
 Apurva vidhi 119
 Aramba vāda 178
 Ardha vainasikas 78
 Artha vāda 98
 Arhata 42, 74
 Arundati 33
 Arulnandi 3, 16
 Arthapatti 211, 364
 Asadyonirvana 50, 55
 Āsakti 220
 Asat 10, 289, 291, 293, 327, 367
 Asrava 74
 Asankai 125
 Asuddha māyā 68, 189
 Atom 78, 79, 159
 Atomists 78, 159
 Atharvasikha 104
 Ātma darsana 337, 361
 Ātma labham 374
 Ātma tattvas 373
 Ātmasrayah 195, 389
 Ātmasuddhi 64, 361
 Avaidiks 3
 Āvainilai 125
 Āvese vāda 123
 Avrtti 266
 Avyakta 210
 Ayurveda 98
 Bauddha 42
 Badarayana 245
 Bhairava 87
 Bharata, The 44, 108, 109
 Bharata tātparya Sangraha 108
 —Bhāvana 77
 Bhautika diksā 56
 Bhedavāda 2, 69,
 Bhoga 89, 175, 180, 182, 183
 Bhranti knowledge 264
 Bhuvana 153, 183, 208
 Bhūtādma 307
 Bhūtādi ahankara 210
 Bindu 39, 174, 178, 182, 206, 256
 Brahma sutras 5, 20, 47
 Brahadāraṇyaka 137

Buddhi 76, 84, 194, 252, 254
 Buddhists 65, 112, 158, 190, 217, 236
 Buddhism 70, 183
 Buddhi tattava 144

Carvakas 69, 95, 98, 145
 Carpu 6
 Caryā 26, 337, 339, 340, 341
 Ceraman Perumal 90
 Chandovisi 97
 Cidacit 209
 Cilappadikaram 3
 Cintya 56
 —cit sakti
 Cirappu 32
 Cit sat 10
 Citta 224, 225

Dakṣa 105, 150
 Darsanaś 362
 Dasa kārya 64, 362
 Dāsa mārga 345
 Deyvam 196
 Dhanur Veda 98
 Dharma 194
 Dhyanī 370
 Dhakṣṇāgni 243
 Diksā 44, 50, 54, 55
 Divya prabhanda 108
 Dravya 76
 Dvādasānta 51
 Dvita 135

Ego 221
 Efficient cause 103, 169
 Ekatmavāda 76
 Ekameva 136
 Ether 239

Gayatri mantra 105
 Garuda bhāvana 304
 Ganges 105, 111
 Gandharva Veda 98
 Gautama 78
 Ganesa 61, 62, 143
 General nature 32, 63
 Gunas 76
 Guna tattva 89, 211

Haradatta 105
 Harinī 131, 182
 Harivamsa 44
 Hautri diksā 50, 55
 Heterodox 3
 Hiranya garbha 48, 110

Impure maya 150
 Indeterminable 170, 171
 Indīrya pratyakṣa 200

Itihasa 90
 Inference 163
 Instrumental cause 29
 Inherent 31, 32, 166
 Intellect 199, 200
 Iruvinai 30, 129, 143
 Iruviraioppu 346
 Isāna 104
 Isāna mantra 182
 Isvara 180, 183, 256, 267

Jati 76, 313
 Jananī 132, 182
 Jainism 66, 183
 Jaiminī 79
 Jiva 74
 Jivan mukta 385
 Jivatma 307
 Jñāna 26, 28, 343
 Jñānapāda 26
 Jñāna dīksā 208
 Jñāta 28
 Jñāna mārga 343
 Jñānamṛtam 33, 36, 101, 116, 117, 118
 153, 155, 253
 Jñāna Sakti 255
 Jñānavatī 51
 Jñāna tiro daka 258
 Jñāna tilaka 54
 Jñāpaka hetu 43
 Jñāpaka Sakti 253
 Judaic 7
 Jyotiṣtoma 45
 Jyotiṣa 97

Kādu Vāzitu 2
 Kālā 69, 103, 153, 174, 186, 189, 197,
 198, 200, 201, 207, 250, 251, 372
 Kāla 187, 206, 207, 248
 Kālas 53
 Kālādhva 53
 Kālagni Rudra 210, 342
 Kalamuka 42
 Kāpālika 42, 66, 87
 Kalittogai 2
 Kamika 44, 57, 182
 Kalpa sutras 45
 Kalpa 97
 Kanāda 78
 Kanchittinai 2
 Kancuka sarira 208, 252
 Kārana 183
 Karaikkal Ammaiya 161
 Kāraka Sakti 253
 Kāraka hebu 43
 Karma 8, 76, 147, 257, 397, 398
 Kārukapadya 242, 243
 Kaulas 216
 Kashmir Saivism 2

Kauṣītaki upaniṣad 46

Ketu 372

Kevala 2, 9, 131, 266

Kevala jāgrat 275

Kevala State 29

Kodikkavi 34, 370

Kol mīn 285

Kriya 26, 337, 340, 341, 394

Kriya kānda kramavali 37

Kṛita brahma vāda 84

Kriyavati 51, 58

Kumara Kurupparar 5

Kulikai 131

Kundali 174

Kuṭila 174

Kurma purana 42

Lakṣaṇa 125

Light of grate 10

Letters five 10

Linga 403

Lighter 31

Laya 89, 175 180

Lokayata 69

Maccha purana 106, 108

Madhva 20, 315

Madhyama 177

Mādhyamika 70, 156

Magutāgama 47

Maha Rudra 60

Maha Moha 220

Mahat 178

Mahavākya 359

Matanga

Mahesvara 89, 104,

Mala 197, 198

Manickavasagar 5, 89, 131, 156, 358

Manas 22, 254

Manavasagam Kadantār 23

Mānasa kāteci 214

Manatam 370

Mantras 53, 58, 403

Mantarātma 307

Mandam 370

Manda saktinipāta 56, 345

Manda malaparipaka 50, 345

Mandatara malaparipaga 50, 345, 348

Manimekalai 3

Mantras 153

Mapadiyam 376

Māyā 7, 8, 9, 24, 29, 103, 114, 145,

148, 155, 156, 166, 168, 170, 172,

180, 206, 249, 257, 397, 398

Matanga 35, 39, 142, 313

Material Cause 29, 100, 156, 159, 162,

169, 172, 174, 176, 177

Mavṛta 66, 87

Māyāvāda 68, 84, 139

Māyāvādin 65, 183, 296

Mayeya 135, 148, 208

Meykandar 3, 16, 20, 27, 63, 66, 135,

269, 294, 295, 324, 385, 390, 391, 408

Mīmamsakas 66, 67, 76, 79, 92, 95, 98

Mind 222

Mingled transformation 183

Mohini 207

Moha 207

Mrgendra 27, 35, 37, 131, 190

Mulādhara 277

Mūla karma 155

Mūla mala 7, 131, 139

Mūla prakṛti 160, 212, 253

Mukti pañcakṣara 31

Mundaka 160

Muraimai 125

Nāda 39, 174, 177, 179, 206

Nāl mīn 285

Naladiyar 338

Naiṣṭhika Dikṣā 56

Nandi Devar 61

Naimittika 58

Naiyayika 78

Naiyayikas 158, 215, 217, 225, 233,

235, 263, 291, 297

Narayana 110, 124

Narayana Kāṇṭha 27

Nimitta kāraṇa Parinama vāda 141

Nirādhara Siva dikṣā 50

Nirvana 70

Nirādhara 351

Nirakara 72

Nirjara 74

Nirvana dikṣā 12, 53, 55

Nirvikalpa 200

Nirvikalpakajñana 73

Nirukta 97

Niskala 180, 342

Nivṛtti 182, 183

Nivṛtti kalā 88, 154

Niyama 215

Niyama vidhi 119

Niyati 188, 189, 196, 207

Nyaya School 66, 76

Obscuration 131

Om 254

Onran irumai 7

Orthodox 3, 76

Padas 53

Pādma purana 42, 44

Pada 153

Pādi kaval 145

Pāl 196

Pankaja 114

Papa 151

- Pancarātra 42, 46, 66, 76, 86, 103, 106, 109, 217, 261
 Paṇini 60
 Pannirupatalam 66
 Para 177
 Parama Siva 89
 Parākhyā 39
 Parapakkam 17
 Parasara 60
 Parigraha Sakti 180
 Parikṣā 125
 Parināma; 84
 Parinama vāda 84, 114, 139
 Pāsa 137, 166, 291, 327
 Pasa jñāna 10, 166, 168, 289, 290
 Pāsa vīdu 7
 Pāsāna vāda saiva 68, 69, 395
 Pasu 110, 137, 166, 327
 Pasu jñāna 166, 289, 360
 Pāsupata 42, 46m 49, 60, 67, 86, 169
 Pasutva 199, 266
 Pasyanti 177, 211
 Patanjālas 298
 Pati 327
 Pati jñana 363
 Paramanu 94
 Parisankhya vidhī 119
 Pauskara 6, 17, 35, 39, 47, 54, 69, 150, 203, 209, 239, 308, 311
 Podu 32, 34
 Porul ulaku 253
 Porripahrodai 128, 274, 277
 Payan iyal 63
 Periyapurānam 48, 132
 Prakṛti 84, 89, 103, 144, 159, 177, 178, 190, 207, 208, 238, 259
 Prakṛti maya 103, 104
 Pralayakalas 50, 150, 175, 207, 208, 266, 407
 Pramāna 78
 Prameya 78
 Pramāna Iyal 63
 Pranāyama 254
 Pranava 58, 255
 Prārabdha 55, 153, 155, 379, 380, 381, 384, 385, 406
 Prasāda Yoga 53, 255
 Pratyakṣa 267
 Pratiṣṭakala 88, 154, 183
 Pravṛtti 182
 Pravṛtti vijñana 73
 Preraka 198
 Primal prakṛti 223
 Puḍgala 74
 Purānas 32, 90, 97, 106, 108
 Puram 66
 Pūmstta mala 207, 208
 Pure adhva 151
 Pure māyā 63, 177
 Purusa tattva 179, 207, 208
 Rajasa 60, 194, 201, 290, 241, 291, Rahu 372
 Raga 187, 190, 202, 204, 206, 207, 208, 234
 Ramanuja 20, 35, 215
 Ratnatraya 179
 Raurva 60
 Rodayitri 132, 182
 Rudra 60, 342
 Rupa Samavadīn 303, 237
 Sabda tanmatra 239
 Sabda brahma vadīn 84
 Sabija dikṣā 59
 Sādaka 50
 Sadakya 60, 267, 279
 Sādāna 36, 63
 Sadasat 327, 332, 382
 Sadasiva 39, 60, 50, 182
 Sādharma dikṣā 50, 351
 Sādrśya 317
 Sadyonirvana 55
 Saha marga 345
 Sahaja mala 9
 Saiva santana ācāryas 6
 Saiva sanṇyasa 12
 Saiva vādi 3
 Sakalāgama Pandita 4, 16
 Sakala 9, 29, 256, 257, 266, 350
 Sakala jagrat 274
 Sakalas 150, 207, 208
 Sakala Niskala 182, 342
 Sākāram 71
 Sāktagamas 44
 Sakti 182
 Saktiman 180
 Saktinipata 56, 338, 345
 Sāloka 342
 Sambandhar 395, 244
 Samaya 51, 53
 Sāmya 317
 Sāmbhava dikṣā 52, 57
 Sāmipa 342
 Samudāya vāda 76
 Samvara 74
 Samyoga 308
 Samavāya 76, 128, 238
 Samavaya kāraṇa 161
 Samyukta samavāya 308
 Samyukta samaveta samavāya 308
 Sañcīta 151, 153, 155, 379
 Sangam literature 2
 Sanskrit 4
 Sankara 20
 Sankalpa 213
 Sankarpa Nirakaranam 66, 68, 141, 164
 Sāṅkhya 65, 66, 76, 84, 112, 159, 210, 235, 281, 293, 317
 Sankranta 260

- Sanatkumara Samhita 46
 Sankranta vādin 123
 Sanmarga 343
 Sāntiatita kala 88, 154, 183
 Sānti kala 88, 154, 183
 Sarvatma Sambhu 49
 Sarvajjanottara 30, 35, 55, 138, 304, 308, 309, 369
 Skandapurana 44
 Sārūpa 344
 Sāyujya 344
 Sat 10
 Sattan 7
 Sataratna Sangraha 6
 Satkarya vada 85, 100, 147, 152, 195, 240, 257, 294
 Satputramārga 344
 Sattva 201, 210, 215, 241
 Sattvika puranas 106
 Sattvika aspect 230
 Sautrantikas 71
 Savikalpa 200
 Savikalpa jñāna 73
 Sedam 394
 Sekkizar 336
 Siddhanta 141
 Siddhanta māvahākyā 139
 Siddhanta Prakāsika 49
 Siddhanta saravali 57
 Suddha Sadana 55
 Siva 1, 2
 Sikṣa 97
 Siva-sat 394, 395
 Siva darsana 64, 361
 Siva dharmini 50, 56, 58
 Sivaditta Mani Dipika 48, 163, 258
 Siva Dharmottara 55
 Sivadvaita 141, 163
 Sivadvaitin 65, 114, 132, 140, 298, 315, 321, 388
 Sivagamas 3, 19, 20, 26, 36, 48, 56, 60, 61, 67, 97, 182, 183
 Sivagita 108
 Sivagni 51
 Sivajñāna 10, 37
 Sivajñāna Bodham 4, 6, 8, 16, 61, 63, 66, 165, 174, 408
 Sivajñāna Munivar 4, 26, 253
 Sivajñāna Siddhiyar, 4, 16, 26, 48, 52, 54, 89, 95, 117, 122, 128, 131, 134, 145, 146, 165, 174, 178, 180, 186, 189, 190, 198, 203, 214, 249, 251, 268, 279, 317, 342, 390
 Sivahood 16
 Svanubhutiman bhavati 384
 Sivaprakasam 4, 6, 26, 36, 37, 54, 55, 64, 95, 122, 134, 140, 141, 142, 155, 158, 165, 167, 178, 179, 180, 183, 186, 189, 190, 203, 210, 224, 225, 271, 279, 280, 289, 310, 317, 329, 349, 350, 378, 388
 Sivapperu 7, 64
 Sivapunya 339
 Sivapuranas 106, 108, 157
 Sivarahasya 108
 Siva rupa 64
 Siva-Sat 10, 289
 Siva sama vāda 123, 300, 301
 Siva sama vada maruppu 302
 Siva Tattva Viveka 48, 90, 109
 Sivatva 384
 Sivativmasi 359
 Sivaya nama 255, 279, 363
 Six darsanas 48
 Skandha 73
 Skandha Purana 106
 Smrtis 90, 216
 Somasambhu Sivacarya 38
 Soma Sambhu Paddhati 38, 52, 285
 Sparsa tanmātra 237
 Special nature 32, 63
 Sri kantha 3, 20, 39, 158, 163, 342
 Sri kantha Rudra 175
 Sruti 90
 Sruti suktimala 44
 suddha adhva 150
 Suddha avastha 29, 266
 Suddhadvaita 2
 suddha maya 68, 175
 Suddha saiva 68, 141
 Suta Samhita 42, 46
 Suddha tattva 68
 suddha vidya 68, 69, 198
 Sūksma 177
 Sūrya 71, 103
 Sundarar 5, 14, 89
 Supreme Being 29, 30
 Supāla 109
 Sūtras 90, 91
 Suddhi 362
 Svatah prāmānya 67
 Svetasvatara 35, 111, 115, 121, 137, 161
 Svarupa laksana 32, 127
 Svayambuvam 39
 Svavedana pratyaksa 200
 Syadvāda 76, 103
 Tamas 106, 194, 201, 210, 215, 217, 259
 Tādātmya 7, 166, 285, 317
 Tadatmya Sakti 7
 Tamil 241
 Tatastha laksana 32, 127
 Taittiriya upanīśad 46, 244
 Tadalai 62
 Tarka 76
 Tamistra 220
 Tattvamasī 295

- Tattvas 153
 Taddharma dharmi 309
 Tanmātras 160, 238
 Tattva prakasika 190
 Tanu 183
 Tertiary 64
 Transformation 183
 Time 189, 194, 195, 207
 Time of Time 189
 Tirobhava 129, 245
 Tirodhana 9, 166
 Tirodhana Sakti 148
 Tirukkural 4, 293, 352
 Tiruvundiya 6, 17, 36
 Tirukkalliruppadiyar 6, 17, 36, 285, 314, 352, 383
 Tirumuraigal 4
 Tirumūlar 3
 Tirucirrambalakkovaiyar 5
 Tiruvāvaduturai 12, 25
 Tirutondattogai 5
 Tirunandi Devar 39
 Tiruvasagam 5, 89, 128, 156, 162, 325
 Tiruvalluvar 207
 Tirujnana Sambandhar 89, 90, 122
 Tiruvarupayan 5, 6, 155, 166, 178, 232, 280
 Tiruppasuram 48, 122
 Tivra malaparipaka 50
 Tivratara malaparipaka 50
 Tivra saktinipata 56
 Tolkappiyam 2, 66, 347
 Tolkappiyar 155
 Tripitaka 70
 Tūlarundati nyāya 33, 48
 Turiya state 27, 105
 Turia murti 105
 Tugalaru Bodham 198
 Turiatita 277, 384
 Tusti 218
 Upadhi 313
 Uma 11
 Unmai 32
 Unmai Vilakkam 5, 224, 225
 Unmaineri vilakkam 362
 Uj 196
 Ulga dharmini 56, 58
 Umapati 23, 68, 158, 347, 377
 Upakrama 32
 Upangas 97
 Upaveda 97
 Upasamhara 32, 43
 Upanisads 4, 20, 36, 67, 111, 135, 138
 Uyirppadakkam 271
 Uttesa 125, 247
 Upamanyu 139
 Utpatti vāda 123
 Uttamas 71
 Vacakam 370
 Vaidiks 3, 151
 Vagisvara 53
 Vagisvari 53
 Vaibhāsikas 71
 Vaikhari 177
 Vaisesika 77
 Vairava 66
 Vaisesikas 76, 78, 238
 Valvīnai 379
 Vāma 66, 87
 Vamadeva guhya 182
 Vamadeva 138
 Vanjiturai 62
 Vārtikam 14, 21, 26
 Vaṣudeva 103, 104
 Vasista linga 42
 Varnam 153
 Vatula 183
 Vāyu Samhita 46, 60
 Vedāngas 97
 Vedānta 20, 36, 141, 407
 Vedānta sūtras 20
 Vedas 3, 20, 32, 39, 97, 137
 Vedagamas 43
 Vedic 3, 20, 43, 46, 135
 Vibhāsa 74
 Vidya kala 88, 154, 183, 252
 Vidhi 196
 Vidya tattva 199, 200, 201, 206, 207, 372
 Vijnāna 73, 267, 303
 Vijnānakalas 50, 55, 69, 150, 175, 207, 266, 267, 350, 351, 406, 407
 Vijnāna Dikṣā 52
 Vikalpa 213
 Vina Venba 376
 Vira Saivism 2
 Visesa 76
 Visesa dikṣā 53
 Visista 2
 Visistadvaita 315
 Vyāsa 106
 Vyanjaka 31
 Vyākaraṇa 97
 Yagas 66, 76, 85
 Yogacāra 71
 Yama 105, 215
 Yoga 26, 337, 339, 340, 341